LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JUN 24 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

NO. 75-1429

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE,
PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE,

vs.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, HSC*, NO. 6102, (5930)
STEPHANIE KOKERNAK, HSC*, NO. 5943,
ROBERT HOGAN and/or HOGAN, ROTHER, GRIMES & BYBEE, HSC*, NO. 5971,
EDWARD CHUN and/or CHUN, KERR, DODD, HSC*, NO. 5903,
JUDGE B. VITOUSEK and/or the FAMILY COURT, AND/OR JUDGE NORITO KAWAKAMI of the CIRCUIT COURT, both of the FIRST CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII, HSC*, NO. 6008,
DR. BETTY ADAMS and/or HAWAII'S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH and/or GERRY NAGAHISA and/or the ADULT SERVICE BRANCH of the STATE OF HAWAII'S FAMILY COURT, FIRST CIRCUIT, HSC* NO. 5924,
HAROLD NICKELSEN and/or CONROY, HAMILTON, GIBSON, NICKELSEN, & RUSH, HSC*, NO. 5969,
JAMES KOSHIBA and/or the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION, HSC*, NO. 5970
ROBERT FRANKLIN, HSC*, NO. 5949,
RESPONDENTS APPELLEES.

JOINT PETITION FOR REHEARING
FOR JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Janice Ching Yee
JANICE CHING YEE
Petitioner Appellant Pro Se,
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

*HSC -HAWAII SUPREME COURT

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 75-1429

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE,
PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE,

vs.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, HSC*, NO. 6102, (5930)
STEPHANIE KOKERNAK, HSC*, NO. 5943,
ROBERT HOGAN and/or HOGAN, ROTHER, GRIMES & BYBEE, HSC*, NO. 5971,
EDWARD CHUN and/or CHUN, KERR, DODD, HSC*, NO. 5903,
JUDGE B. VITOUSEK and/or the FAMILY COURT, AND/OR JUDGE NORITO KAWAKAMI of the CIRCUIT COURT, both of the FIRST CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII, HSC*, NO. 6008,
DR. BETTY ADAMS and/or HAWAII'S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH and/or GERRY NAGAHISA and/or the ADULT SERVICE BRANCH of the STATE OF HAWAII'S FAMILY COURT, FIRST CIRCUIT, HSC* NO. 5924,
HAROLD NICKELSEN and/or CONROY, HAMILTON, GIBSON, NICKELSEN, & RUSH, HSC*, NO. 5969,
JAMES KOSHIBA and/or the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION, HSC*, NO. 5970
ROBERT FRANKLIN, HSC*, NO. 5949,
RESPONDENTS APPELLEES.

JOINT PETITION FOR REHEARING
FOR JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Janice Ching Yee
JANICE CHING YEE
Petitioner Appellant Pro Se,
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

*HSC–HAWAII SUPREME COURT.

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

EDWARD Y. C. CHUN of
CHUN, KERR, & DODD
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, ET AL,
at: Suite 1408, AmFac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

WILLIAM McCORRISTON of
GOODSILL, ANDERSON, & QUINN
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
EDWARD Y. C. CHUN, ET AL,
at: 1600 Castle & Cooke Building,
Financial Plaza
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

WILLIAM L. FLEMING of
CADES, SCHUTTE, FLEMING & WRIGHT
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
ROBERT HOGAN, ET AL;
HAROLD NICKELSEN, ET AL;
JAMES KOSHIBA and/or the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION,
at: 165 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RONALD AMEMIYA (694) and
NELSON CHANG (726)
Attorney General and Deputy for Respondents-Appellees:
GERRY NAGAHISA, ET AL; and/or
DR. BETTY ADAMS, ET AL,
AND/OR:
JUDGE B. M. VITOUSEK, ET AL; and/or
JUDGE NORITO KAWAKAMI
at: HAWAII STATE CAPITOL
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

MAX GARCIA
Attorney for Respondent-Appellee:
ROBERT FRANKLIN
at: Suite 990 Pacific Trade Center
190 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

POOR COPY

INDEX

page

Table of Cases ii
Statutes ..... iii, iv
Text Books iv
I. OPINIONS BELOW 2
II. JURISDICTION 2
III. QUESTIONS PRESENTED 4
IV. STATUTES INVOLVED 4
V. STATEMENT OF CASE 12
VI. REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS WRIT 12
VII. CONCLUSIONS 18
CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE: APPENDED
APPENDICES:
APPENDIX "A. III"
APPENDIX "AA. III"
APPENDIX "B. III"
APPENDIX "C. III"
APPENDIX "D. III"
APPENDIX "E. III"

TABLE OF CASES

pages

1. *U.S. v. Bankers Trust Co.*, 294 U.S. 240 5
2. *Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton R. Co.*, 295 U.S. 330 5
3. *Rickert Rice Mills v. Fontenot*, 297 U.S. 110 5
4. *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 110 5
5. *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U.S. 1 5
6. *U.S. v. United Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258 5
7. *Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 5
8. *U.S. vs. Tandaric, C. C. A. Ind.* 1945 152 F. 2d 3 certiorari denied 66 S. ct. 703, 327 U.S. 786, 90 L. Ed. 1012 17
9. *In re Williams, D. C. 1958*, 157, F. Supp. 871, affirmed 252 F. 2d 629, 102 U.S. App. D.C. 248 17
10. *Baker vs. U.S. 1968*, 401 F. 2d 958, 131 U.S. App. D.C. 7, on remand 301 F. Supp. 973 18
11. *Henderson v. U.S., D.C. Cal, 1964* 231 F. Supp. 177 18

BLEED THROUGH

STATUTES

1. *STATUTES INVOLVED* 5
   THE UNITED STATES
2. *SUPREME COURT RULES* 5
   - Rule 19(1)(a & b) 2,5,20
   - Rule 20 2,5
   - Rule 23(5) 2,5
   - Rule 24(5) 2,5
   - Rule 46 5

3. *THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND AMENDMENTS* 2,5,16,19,20
   - AMENDMENT I 2,5,11,16,17,18,19,20
   - AMENDMENT IV 2,5,11,18,19,20
   - AMENDMENT V 2,5,11,16,17,18,19,20
   - AMENDMENT VI 2,5,12,19,20
   - AMENDMENT VIII 2,5,12,19,20
   - AMENDMENT XIII 3,5,12,20
   - AMENDMENT XIV 3,5,12,16,17,19,20
   - AMENDMENT XIX 3,5,12,19,20
   - AMENDMENT XXVII 3,5,12,19,20

4. *HAWAII SUPREME COURT RULES* 3,6
   - Rule 1(a)(1) 3,6
   - Rule 2(d) 3,6
   - Rule 6(b) 3,6
   - Rule 16.1 and Rule 16.2 3,6

   CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:
   - EC2-27 6
   - EC2-28 6
   - EC2-30 3,6
   - EC7-5 3,6
   - EC7-21 3,6
   - EC7-22 3,6
   - EC7-26 3,6

   CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S DISCIPLINARY RULES:
   - DR1-102 3,7
   - DR2-110B(1 & 2) 3,8

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

5. *HAWAII REVISED STATUTES:*

Chapter	551-26	9
	551-27	9
	551-30	9
	551-31	9
	551-34	9
	602-5	3,9
	605-2	3,9
	622-19	9
	634-20	3,9,14
	641-4	3,9
	641-24	3,9
	657-20	3,9
	711-21	9
	711-22	9
	711-23	9
	728-1	9
	728-2	9
	728-3	9
	728-4	9

6. *HAWAII RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE OR FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:*

Rule 12(c)	3,10
Rule 12(f)	3,10
Rule 56(a)	11
Rule 59	11
Rule 73	3,11
Rule 75(d)	3,11

7. *HAWAII FAMILY COURT RULES:*

Rule 91(a), specifically not (b)	3,12

8. *FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE:*

Chapter 133:28 (sec. 2101(c))	3,11
Chapter 133:28 (sec. 2101(e))	3,11
Chapter 133:28 (sec. 2106)	3,11

TEXT BOOKS

1. *LAW OF TORTS by William Prosser, 1964 (3rd. Ed.)* page 869 12
2. *WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA (Vol. 19) 1971*, page 141-145 2,11
3. *U. S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5* 1972..... 11,18,19

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1975

NO. 75-1429

JANICE CHING YEE,

PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE,

vs.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, HSC*, NO. 6102, (5930)
STEPHANIE KOKERNAK, HSC*, NO. 5943.
ROBERT HOGAN and/or HOGAN, ROTHER, GRIMES & BYBEE, HSC*, NO. 5971,
EDWARD CHUN and/or CHUN, KERR, DODD, HSC*, No. 5903, JUDGE B. VITOUSEK and/or the FAMILY COURT, AND/OR JUDGE NORITO KAWAKAMI of the CIRCUIT COURT, both of the FIRST CIRCUIT OF THE THE STATE OF HAWAII, HSC*, NO. 6008,
DR. BETTY ADAMS and/or HAWAII'S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH and/or GERRY NAGAHISA and/or the ADULT SERVICE BRANCH of the STATE OF HAWAII'S FAMILY COURT, FIRST CIRCUIT, HSC* NO. 5924,
HAROLD NICKELSEN and/or CONROY, HAMILTON, GIBSON, NICKELSEN, & RUSH, HSC*, NO. 5969,
JAMES KOSHIBA and/or the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION, HSC*, NO. 5970,
ROBERT FRANKLIN, HSC*, NO. 5949,
RESPONDENTS APPELLEES.

JOINT PETITION FOR REHEARING
FOR JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

JANICE CHING YEE, THE PETITIONER APPELLANT HEREIN, prays that a rehearing and reconsideration for a Writ of Certiorari to Review and/or Direct the Judgment of Hawaii's Supreme Court per discretion, prerogative, and initiative of This United States Supreme Court to SETTLE THESE CASES PRESENTED for Review of the Judgments and Opinions entered in the lower Courts

POOR COPY

Below, as set forth in Petitioner Appellant's "Joint Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States", filed April 7, 1976, and "Supplement to Joint Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States", filed April 19, 1976.

Both parties of all cases are residents of the State of Hawaii.

I. *OPINIONS BELOW*

Requested for inclusion for Review is the recent Orders filed June 7, 1976 at 11:09 a.m., denying Appellant's "Motion for Amendment to include all additional Record on Appeal for Consideration," filed May 21, 1976 "for lack of specificity and the failure of movant to show that there are additional records to which she is entitled," hereby appended as APPENDIX "A.III".

The denied "Motion" is hereby appended as APPENDIX "AA.III" for Review by This Supreme Court of America against the Prejudiced Persecution experienced by Petitioner Appellant Pro Se against the non-inclusion of the "Second Amendment of Notice of Appeal"(APP. "I(B)(b)" of Supplement to Joint Petition) in the Court Record on Appeal, wherefore the lower Circuit Court clerks refused to include this "Amendment" in the Record on Appeal (APP. "B(3)(a)" of Joint Petition) for the Supreme Court unless ordered by the Supreme Court, who denied this "Motion" for inclusion, (APPENDIX "AA.III") which could have been Granted according to HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 75(d).

II. *JURISDICTION*

The Jurisdiction of This Supreme Court of the United States whereby it can Review and/or Direct New Order for Judgment AND/OR Settlement of these cases in This Court; was invoked under:

1. The *UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES:*
   1) Rule 19(1)(a & b);
   2) Rule 20
   3) Rule 23(5)
   4) Rule 24(5)
2. The *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS*, specifically:
   1) *AMENDMENT I*
   2) *AMENDMENT IV*
   3) *AMENDMENT V*
   4) *AMENDMENT VI*
   5) *AMENDMENT VIII*

* *WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA (vol.19) 1971, pg. 141-145*

6) *AMENDMENT XIII*
7) *AMENDMENT XIV*
8) *AMENDMENT XIX*
9) *AMENDMENT XXVII*

3. *HAWAII SUPREME COURT RULES:*
   1) Rule 1(a)(1)
   2) Rule 2(d)
   3) Rule 6(b)
   4) Rule 16.1 and 16.2
   5) CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S:
      A. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, specifically:
         a) EC2-30
         b) EC7-5
         c) EC7-21
         d) EC7-22
         e) EC7-26
      B. DISCIPLINARY RULES, specifically:
         a) DR1-102
         b) DR2-110B(1 & 2)

4. *HAWAII REVISED STATUTES:*
   1) Chapter 602-5
   2) Chapter 634-20
   3) Chapter 641-4
   4) Chapter 641-24
   5) Chapter 657-20
   6) Chapter 728-(1,2,3, & 4)

5. *HAWAII RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:*
   OR FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:
   1) Rule 12(c)
   2) Rule 12(f)
   3) Rule 73
   4) Rule 75(d)

6. *HAWAII FAMILY COURT RULES:*
   1) Rule 91(a), specifically not (b).

7. *FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE:*
   1) Chapter 133:28(sec.2101(c))
   2) Chapter 133:28(sec.2101(e))
   3) Chapter 133:28(sec.2106)

POOR COPY

III. *QUESTION*

1. WHY DO HAWAII'S COURTS NOT BELIEVE IN LEGAL RIGHTS FOR PLAINTIFF APPELLANT PRO SE, JANICE CHING YEE, WHO APPEALS HERE FOR JUSTICE FOR PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE.

Hawaii's Courts should believe in all American Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee who Appeals against all Defendants-Appellees, whose Malice Conspired for Deprivation of American Legal Rights for Income for Appellant against their Coerced Ignominy by Defamatory Prejudiced Persecution for non-assertion of All American Legal Rights for same Appellant against Coerced "involuntary financial servitude" which has been brought out in all Pleadings for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se and can be further explained in Part V. *REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI*.

2. HOW CAN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DENY THE ERRORS COMMITTED BY HAWAII'S LOWER COURTS WERE UNCONSTITUTIONAL?

The United States Supreme Court should Rule against Hawaii's Lower Courts who were Unconstitutional, as Malfeasant, Prejudiced, Vacillatory Adjudicators whose Conflict for Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Prejudiced Persecution for Coerced Ignominy by Deprivation of Income and Legal American Rights against Coerced Non-assertion of American Legal Rights against Judicial "involuntary financial enslavement", which was brought out in all Pleadings for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se and can be further explained in Part *V. REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI*.

IV. *STATUTES INVOLVED*

The following Statutes were involved:

1. The *UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES:*
   1) Rule 19(1)(a & b), as pled previously.
   2) Rule 20, re-emphasized and/or as pled previously:

> "A writ of Certiorari to review a case pending in a court of appeals, before judgment is given in such court, will be granted only upon a showing that the

case is of such imperative public importance as to justify the deviation from normal appellate processes and to require immediate SETTLEMENT IN THIS COURT. U.S. v. Bankers Trust Co., 294 U.S. 240; Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton R. Co., 295 U.S. 330; Rickert Rice Mills v. Fontenot, 297 U.S. 110; Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238; Ex parte Quirin, 317 U.S. 1; U.S. v. United Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258; Youngstown Co. v. Sawyer 343 U.S. 579."

PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE Petitions and Appeals here against the unconstitutional judgments by Hawaii's lower Courts against the *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND AMENDMENTS*, specifically:

a) Amendment I, as pled previously.
b) Amendment IV, as pled previously.
c) Amendment V, against "PUBLIC DANGER" of Unconstitutional Judgments against the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS AMENDMENTS, for Freedom for America and Americans.
d) Amendment VI, as pled previously.
e) Amendment VIII, as pled previously.
f) Amendment XIII, as pled previously.
g) Amendment XIV, as pled previously.
h) Amendment XIX, as pled previously.
i) Amendment XXVII, as pled previously.

3) Rule 23#5, as pled previously, excluding other non-pertinent parts of Rule 23.
4) Rule 24#5, specifically, as pled previously.
5) Rule 46: "Parties interested jointly, severally, or otherwise in a judgment may join in an appeal or a petition for writ of certiorari therefrom; or, without summons and severance, any one or more of them may appeal or petition separately or any two or more of them may join in an appeal or petition."

Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered for the joinder of Judge Norito Kawakami, Respondent-Appellee, whose Conflict was Malfeasance for Prejudiced Persecution by biased Judgments, whereof this was pled previously.

2. *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES:*

1) Rule 1(a)(1), as pled previously.
It is noted here, the HAWAII SUPREME COURT RULES apply to all the Courts of Hawaii.
2) Rule 2(d), as pled previously.
3) Rule 6(b), as pled previously.
4) Rule 16.1 and Rule 16.2, as pled previously.

A. *THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S:*

1) ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

1a) EC2-27 against the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION, as pled previously.

1b) EC2-28 against the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION, as pled previously.

1c) EC2-30, as pled previously.

1d) EC7-5: "A lawyer""may continue in the representation of his client even though his client has elected to pursue a course of conduct contrary to the advice of the lawyer so long as he does not thereby knowingly assist the client to engage in illegal conduct or to take a frivolous legal position. *A lawyer should never encourage or aid his client to commit criminal acts* or counsel his client on how to violate the law and avoid punishment therefor."

Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals against Respondents-Appellees Edward Chun et al, attorneys who conducted a malicious defense for Respondents-Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee et al for mental and financial injury against Appellant Janice Ching Yee.

1e) EC7-21, as pled previously.

1f) EC7-22, as pled previously.

1g) EC7-26: "The law and Disciplinary Rules prohibit the use of fraudulent, false, or perjured testimony or evidence. A lawyer who knowingly participates in introduction of such testimony or evidence is subject to discipline."

Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals to This Court to consider this against the Conspiracy of all Respondents-Appellees for Prejudiced Persecution as instigated and perpetrated by Respondent-Appellee, vacillatory, malfeasant Judge B. Vitousek, whose malice accepted "fraudulent, false or perjured testimony or evidence" of Respondents-Appellees Dr. Betty Adams, whose malice contributed to loss of custody and/or to the Illegal "guardian ad litem", or Respondents-Appellees Harold Nickelsen et al, whose void position was a restraintive "false arrest" for humiliation of Petitioner Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee, who never committed adultery, deliberate crime or deliberate sin, as acceptance of Respondents-Appellees, Gerry Nagahisa, et al's "fraudulent, false or perjured testimony" which also contributed to loss of custody and/or the Illegal "guardian" as mentioned; all of which was accepted by malicious, malfeasant Respondents-Appellees Edward Chun, et al, as another instigator and perpetrator, AND/OR malfeasant, malevolent, "traitor" Robert Hogan et al, Respondents-Appellees, whose malice deliberately neglected to Appeal against this "fraudulent, false, or perjured testimony or evidence" and/or the loss of custody and/or the restraintive Illegal "guardian ad litem."

2.A.2) *DISCIPLINARY RULES*

2a) DR1-102: "MISCONDUCT."

"(A) A Lawyer shall not:

(1) Violate a Disciplinary Rule.

(2) Circumvent a Disciplinary Rule through actions of another.

(3) Engage in illegal conduct involving moral turpitude.

(4) Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation.

(5) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to administration of *justice*.

(6) Engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on his fitness to practice law."

POOR COPY

Petitioner Appellant hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered against Respondents-Appellees Robert Hogan, et al; Respondents-Appellees Edward Chun, et al; Respondents-Appellees Harold Nickelsen, et al; Respondents-Appellees James Koshiba, and/or Respondents-Appellees the Hawaii Bar Association; Respondents-Appellees Robert Franklin, AND/OR Respondents-Appellees Judge Betty Vitousek, et al, whose malice for Conspiracy for Prejudiced Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Deprivation of Income and American Legal Rights for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se can be termed misconduct, malfeasance, malevolence, malice, conflict, conspiracy, violation of Legal Rights against fraud, breach of contract, misrepresentation, deceit, and obstruction of Justice for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se for disbarment of Respondents-Appellees mentioned, who should not have the opportunity to do this again against any unsuspecting citizen.

2b) DR2-110B(1 & 2): "MANDATORY WITHDRAWAL."

"A lawyer representing a client before a tribunal, with its permission if required by its rules, shall withdraw from employment, and a lawyer representing a client in other matters shall withdraw from employment, if:

(1) He knows or it is obvious that his client is bringing the legal action, conducting the defense, or asserting a position in the litigation, or is otherwise having steps taken for him, merely for the purpose of harassing or maliciously injuring any person.

(2) He knows or it is obvious that his continued employment will result in violation of a Disciplinary Rule."

Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered against Respondents-Appellees Edward Chun, et al, for violation of this Disciplinary Rule.

BLEED THROUGH

3. *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES*
   1) Chapter 551-26, as previously noted.
   2) Chapter 551-27, as pled previously.
   3) Chapter 551-30, as pled previously.
   4) Chapter 551-31, as pled previously.
   5) Chapter 551-34, as previously noted.
   6) Chapter 602-5, as pled previously.
   7) Chapter 605-2, as pled previously.
   8) Chapter 622-19, as pled previously.
   9), Chapter 634-20; "*Amendments of pleadings and process.*

   Whenever a plaintiff in an action shall have mistaken the form of action suited to his claim, the court or judge, on motion, shall permit amendments to be made on such terms as it or he shall adjudge reasonable; and the court or judge may, in furtherance of justice and on the like terms, at the trial or on appeal, or at any other stage, before or after judgment, allow any petition or pleading or process or proceeding to be amended by adding or striking out the name of any party, or by correcting a mistake in the name of a party or a mistake in any other respect, or by inserting other allegations material to the case, or, when the amendment does not substantially change the claim or defense, by conforming the pleadings or the proceedings to the facts proved. (CC 1859, +1145; am L 1903, c 78, +1; RL 1925, +2360; RL 1935, +4097; RL 1945, +10079; RL 1955, +230-53)"

Petitioner Appellant Pre Se hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered for REASON #3 for GRANTING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

   10) Chapter 641-4, as pled previously.
   11) Chapter 641-24, as pled previously.
   12) Chapter 657-20, as pled previously.
   13) Chapter 711-21, as pled previously.
   14) Chapter 711-22, as pled previously.
   15) Chapter 711-23, as pled previously.
   16) Chapter 728-1, as pled previously.
   17) Chapter 728-2, as pled previously.
   18) Chapter 728-3, as pled previously.
   19) Chapter 728-4, as pled previously.

POOR COPY

4. *HAWAII RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE OR THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:*
   1) Rule 12(c), as pled previously.
   2) Rule 12(f): "*Motion to Strike*. Upon motion made by a party before responding to a pleading or, if no responsive pleading is permitted by these rules, upon motion made by a party within 20 days after the service of the pleading upon him or upon the court's own initiative at any time, the court may order stricken from any pleading any insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter."

   Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered for Motions to Strike the perjured, defamatory, scandalous Dr. Adams' "severe chronic mental illness" report AND/OR social worker Gerry Nagahisa's perjured defamatory "talks to herself", "behavior does not relate to the children" or "Tuesday is a bad day" reports, which caused loss of custody of the children to Appellant or caused the Illegal "guardian ad litem" Order, or Trust Agreement and "Trustee" Order, which was a Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process.
   3) Rule 56(a), as pled previously.
   4) Rule 59, as pled previously.
   5) Rule 73, as pled previously.
   6) Rule 75(d): *RECORD ON APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT.*

      (d) "*Correction or Modification of the Record.*

      If any difference arises as to whether the record truly discloses what occurred in the circuit court, the difference shall be submitted to and settled by that court and the record made to conform to the truth. If anything material to either party is omitted from the record by error or accident or is misstated therein, the parties by stipulation of the circuit court either before or after the record is transmitted to the supreme

court or the supreme court on proper suggestion or of its own initiative, may direct that the omission or misstatement be corrected, and if necessary that a supplemental record be certified and transmitted. All other questions as to the form and content of the record shall be presented to the supreme court."

Petitioner Appellant Pro Se hereby Petitions and Appeals for this to be considered for Review of the *OPINIONS BELOW* and/or *REASON #4 for GRANTING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI.*

5. *FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL AND APPELLATE PROCEDURE:*
   1) Chapter 133:28(sec. 2101(c)), as pled previously.
   2) Chapter 133:28(sec. 2101(e)), as pled previously.
   3) Chapter 133:28(sec. 2106), as pled previously.

6. *The UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS:***
   1) Amendment I, as pled previously.
   2) Amendment IV, as pled previously.
   3) Amendment V:*** "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Military when in actual service in time of war or PUBLIC DANGER; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

***WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA (vol. #19), 1971, pg. 141-145.*
****U.S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5, 1972.*

POOR COPY

4) Amendment VI, as pled previously.
5) Amendment VIII, as pled previously.
6) Amendment XIII, as pled previously.
7) Amendment XIV, as pled previously.
8) Amendment XIX, as pled previously.
9) Amendment XXVII, as pled previously.

7. *HAWAII FAMILY COURT RULES:*
Rule 91(a), as pled for Appellant Pro Se as Plaintiff Pro Se who should not be denied consideration of pleadings

8. TREATISE: LAW OF TORTS by William Prosser, (3rd Edition), 1964, page 869, as pled previously.

V. *STATEMENT OF THE CASE*

For further confirmation of the facts of the cases for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se, hereby has been appended as APPENDIX "B.III"; a "More Comprehensive Affidavit of Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se", for case HSC, No. 6102, filed June 7, 1976, and may it apply as an affidavit and Restatement of these cases for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se for a fast reasonable settlement of these cases for same Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee.

VI. *REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS JOINT PETITION FOR REHEARING FOR JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.*

1. In reiteration and re-emphasis, Hawaii's Supreme Court was in ERROR for Affirming the Orders, Judgments, and Decrees of the lower Circuit Court of Hawaii for all cases other than HSC, No. 6102, which does not have its final judgment yet. The Lower Circuit Court was in Harmful, Prejudiced, Reversible Error for their Orders, Judgments, and Decrees were for Respondents Appellees as Defendants(-Appellees) who were all in Conspiracy as Conspirators* and/or Contributory Conspirators*, whereby all conspired and colluded for Prejudicial Judicial Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Humiliation by Defamatory, Libelous, and Slanderous Coerced Ignominy by Coerced Incompetency and Destitution by Judicial "financial enslavement" and Judicial "involuntary servitude" for Swindle by Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se.

*all RESPONDENTS-APPELLEES

2. Hawaii's Supreme Court should have Granted and Ordered Judgment on the Pleadings for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se as pled for Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se; and should have voided the lower Circuit Court's Prejudiced Judgments since all Respondents-Appellees as Defendants-Appellees Defaulted technically in Hawaii's Supreme Court against the "Motion to Consolidate Appeals against Conspiracy for Prejudiced Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant; Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings"; filed December 5, 1975, whereby the cover for this "Motion" is hereby appended as APPENDIX "C(3)(III)" having been inadvertently left out of the previous APPENDIX "C(3)" of the Joint Petition, filed April 7, 1976.

3. Hawaii's Supreme Court should not have affirmed the lower Circuit Courts PREJUDICED ERROR, wherefore, according to *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 634-20,* the lower Circuit Court or the Judge could have used initiative, prerogative, and discretion to amend pleadings or direct to the right court for proper pleadings against Respondents-Appellees as Defendents(Appellees), who were criminals in violation of all of Petitioner Appellant's American Legal Rights as pled as Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se against Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Conspiracy for Prejudiced Persecution for Depriviation of Income and all American Legal Rights for same Appellant, as pled previously.

4. Hawaii's Supreme Court should have considered case No. 5930, using initiative, prerogative and discretion for REASON against delay as harassment and provokement for mental and financial injury of Petitioner Appellant Pro Se, who pled as Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se. Hawaii's Supreme Court could have seen the lower Family Court's Judgments were for Unequitable Distribution of Income and all American Legal Rights for same Appellant. Also, this case HSC No. 5930 should be included in the Court Records of Appeal for case HSC No. 6102 wherefore case HSC No. 5930 is part and parcel of case HSC, No. 6102, as pled (APP. "AA.III") and denied by Order of June 7, 1976. (APPENDIX "A.III")

POOR COPY

5. Hawaii's Supreme Court should not seem to contribute to Prejudiced Judicial Persecution for Deprivation of all American Legal Rights for income for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se, who cannot understand the refusal of the clerks of Hawaii's Supreme Court to file Appellant's "Motion for Relief of Judgment and/or Amendment of Opening Brief to Conform to the Evidence, etc.; OR the refusal of the Justices to approve filing of this "Motion" after they read or considered the "Motion", hereby appended as APPENDIX "D.III".

OR, the refusal of the clerks to file Appellant's Reply Brief for case HSC, No. 6102, dated May 22, 1976, in view of the fact Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, Defaulted by submitting an insufficient Answering Brief by way of a "Motion to Dismiss, etc." filed May 3, 1976 at 3:59 p.m., the date the Answering Brief was due for Appellant's Opening Brief, filed March 2, 1976.

AND/OR refusal of Hawaii's Justices to approve filing of this Reply Brief hereby appended as APPENDIX "E.III", *after* they considered it; AND THEN refusal of the clerks to file Appellant's "Motion to Strike Appellees' Motion to Dismiss, etc.", filed May 26, 1976 (not appended) unless the Reply Brief appended as EXHIBIT "A" (APPENDIX "E.III") was deleted; AND THEN AGAIN refusal of Hawaii's Justices to accept this Reply Brief for itself or as EXHIBIT "A" for "Motion to Strike, etc." at the recent hearing labeled for "Motion to Dismiss, etc." for Appellees, on June 4, 1976 at 9:30 a.m. (APPENDIX "F.III")

APPELLANT HEREBY APPEALS TO THIS COURT to consider APP. "E.III" as evidence of Hawaii's Supreme Court clerks' unconstitutional violation of Appellant's American Legal Rights to plead Pro Se in Hawaii's Supreme Court and/or have proper pleadings to the Supreme Court of Hawaii filed. May this APP. "E III" *not* be considered as a "brief", but can its EXHIBIT "A" of previously submitted financial data for Appellant's pleadings please be considered as more evidence of Unconstitutional malfeasant Judgments by the lower Family Court of Hawaii.

All of this was terrible unconstitutional violation of all of Appellant's Legal American Rights against coercion for non-assertion of all American Legal Rights for Petitioner

BLEED THROUGH

Appellant Pro Se for assertion of all Legal American Rights for income for same Appellant, who hereby Petitions and Appeals to this Supreme Court of America to settle this question in this Supreme Court against the UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDGMENTS AS A PUBLIC DANGER AS A BAD PRECENDENT SET BY HAWAII'S COURTS AGAINST APPELLANT PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE WHO WANTS TO SET A GOOD PRECENDENT FOR CONSTITUTIONAL LAW FOR COMPLETE SETTLEMENT FOR ANY GOOD CAPABLE AMERICAN WOMAN AS APPELLANT WHO NEVER COMMITTED ADULTERY, DELIBERATE CRIME, OR DELIBERATE SIN.

6. Hawaii's Supreme Court could Grant Appellant's Appeal above all for "Temporary Relief" ((APP. "BB(10)" of Supplement for this case USSC No. 75-1429))instead of denial((APP. "J" for Joint Petition(USSC No. 75-1429) of Order for HSC case No. 6102)) and still could Order a money Order for $211,850 as money for petitioner Appellant Pro Se as Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se who pled with heart and soul for more money, whereof Respondents Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee et al once borrowed this money from Appellant whereof Appellee can borrow this amount out of the bank and repay the monthly note of $350.00 to the loan department of the bank who can pay Appellant this $211,850 as part of Complete Settlement for same Appellant against this forced loan to Appellees by the lower Family Court's unconstitutional judgments for "financial enslavement" whereby Appellee Alfred Yee should pay Appellant Pro Se interest for the use of my money and Appellant should not have had to borrow $20,000 at 10% interest whereof all is practically spent to pay unpaid bills in arrears caused by the lower Family Court's Deprivation of income and American Legal Rights for income for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee who pled as Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se, whereof Hawaii's Supreme Court should not have denied Appellant's Appeal for "Temporary Relief" of $211,850 for Appellant against Hawaii's Supreme Court denial which was then affirmation of the lower Family Court's unconstitutional prejudiced malicious judicial "financial enslavement" of PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE JANICE CHING

POOR COPY

YEE who APPEALS FOR FREEDOM AS APPELLANT'S LEGAL AMERICAN RIGHT FOR *THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS*.

This can also be considered against Judge Norito Kawakami whose prejudice in the lower Circuit Court refused to grant Restitution for Appellant who pled as Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se against Appellees as Defendants (Appellees) whose malicious conflict contributed and was part of this Prejudiced Persecution of Appellant Pro Se against this Conspiracy for Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Deprivation of Legal American Rights and income for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se as who pled as Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se.

7. Hawaii's Supreme Court thereby erroneously contributed to the unequitable Judgments of Hawaii's lower Family Courts, which was Unconstitutional against the *CONSTITUTION'S FIFTH AMENDMENT* for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se who re-Petitions and Appeals to this Supreme Court of the U.S. against Hawaii's lower Courts' enslaving "trust agreement" and "trustees", whereof Appellant was put twice in jeopardy of a "false arrest" defamatory "incompetent" position, whereof Appellant proves same Petitioner Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee as a capable American woman, who Appeals to This Supreme Court of America to settle this important question of Federal Constitutional Law against violation, specifically of the *FIRST, FIFTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS:* in this Supreme Court and Order stricken, the "trust agreement" and "trustees", of the Court Order, both of which are not necessary for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se against non-filing or denial of Appellant's "Motion(s) to Strike" the lower court's "involuntary enslavement" type decisions by Judge Vitousek's Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Deprivation of American Legal Rights for Petitioner Appellant for "life, liberty, or property", wherefore Appellant needs my money, so I can save my property against coercion and duress to sell my property which need not be sold after all if I have the $211,850 as real money, as "Temporary Relief" and/or part settlement for Appellant Pro Se.

8. Hawaii's Supreme Court contributed also to the Unequitable Judgments of the lower Family Court against "due process of Law", whereby even Judge Wendall Huddy of the Small Claims Court said the lower Family Court's Judge Vitousek's judgments were "too vague" for judgment for collection of $300. for payment of tree trimming bills in arrears whereof my ex-husband Respondent Appellee Alfred Yee was in contempt of court, for it was decreed he pay it, but he deliberately delayed it for loss of credit for Appellant against being hounded and dunned by the tree trimmers as harassment and humiliation.

FOR: "A statute which forbids the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at the meaning and differ as to its application, violates this clause. (meaning the *FIFTH AMENDMENT*) U.S. vs. Tandaric, C.C.A. Ind. 1945 152 F. 2d 3, certiorari denied 66 S. ct. 703, 327 U.S. 786, 90 L. Ed. 1012."**

Also, Hawaii's Supreme Court should have Stricken and can this Supreme Court of the United States STRIKE the ex-"guardian ad litem" besides the recent "double jeopardy" "trustees" for "no probably cause" per the *FOURTH AMENDMENT* of the *UNITED STATES CONSTITION* against the lower Family Court Vitousek's Violation of the *FIFTH AMENDMENT* again against the "vague" Unconstitutional Decisions for these Restraintive positions against a capable American woman Janice Ching Yee as Petitioner Appellant Pro Se.

FOR: "Mere fact that committment without due process is temporary and for purpose of psychiatric examination renders it no less unlawful. In re Williams, D.C. 1958, 157, F. Supp. 871, affirmed 252 F. 2d 629, 102 U.S. App. D.C. 248."***

9. Hawaii's Supreme Court erroneously contributed to the lower Circuit Courts' and/or the lower Family Courts' bias and/or partiality whereof because of a closed hearing the Trial Judge was Judge and Jury, and in both instances the Judges were prejudiced as discussed and/or pled previously.

**page 485, U.S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5, 1972.

***page 673, U.S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5, 1972

BOOR COPY

FOR: "Even if the trial judge should not have made any reference to defendant at administrative preliminary proceedings designed to test qualifications and availability of persons drawn to serve as jurors, it was far too speculative to say that because his name was mentioned to five prospective jurors who were not ultimately selected, the jury was so biased it could not reach a fair and impartial verdict. Baker vs. U.S. 1968, 401 F. 2d 958, 131 U.S. App. D.C. 7, on remand 301 F. Supp. 973.****

10. Hawaii's Supreme Court was in ERROR for contributing to the lower Circuit Court's ERROR of dismissal of cases against Appellant's as Plaintiff's ex-attorney Appellee Robert Hogan, et al, and/or Appellee Robert Franklin, who were both malfeasant, malicious, malevolent, in conflict, for Conspiracy for Deprivation of income and all Legal American Rights for income for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se against this fraud and breach of contract by both for obstruction of Justice for Petitioner Appellant Pro Se for the *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS*, specifically *AMENDMENT FIVE AND AMENDMENT ONE* for "PETITION" to "the Government for a redress of grievances" for Petitioner as pled previously in the STATEMENT OF THE CASE for JOINT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, case USSC No. 75-1429.

FOR: "Assistance of counsel, whether demanded by this Amendment 5 or Amendment 6, must be effective assistance. Henderson V. U.S., D.C. Cal. 1964, 231 F. Supp. 177."*****

VII. *CONCLUSION*

PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE hereby Petitions for Rehearing for Joint Petition for Writ of Certiorari to Reconsider and Review all cases presented in this Joint Petition; and to include the case against Respondent Appellee Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, as a criminal case for "enslavement" of Petitioner Appellant Pro Se for

****page 635, U.S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5. 1972.

*****page 694, U.S. CODE ANNOTATED. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT 5. 1972

BLEED THROUGH

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, specifically *AMENDMENT ONE* for "Petition to this Government" of the United States "for a redress of grievances" for FREEDOM *AND/OR*, AMENDMENT FOUR, specifically for "due process of law"; *AND/OR*, AMENDMENT FIVE for non-self prosecution, or for "due process of law", or against double jeopardy from the "guardian ad litem", which was dismissed Feb. 12, 1975 and the recent "trustees", which are defamatory against a capable American woman as Appellant against the "trustee agreement" as method of "enslavement financially" and which is Illegal misconduct by Hawaii's lower Courts which is therefore a PUBLIC DANGER AS A BAD PRECEDENT FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AGAINST *AMERICA'S CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS* AND CAN BE SETTLED BY THIS SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, according to *Rule 19(1)(b) or Rule 20* of the *UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES*: whereby: since case HSC No. 6102, is pending in Hawaii's Supreme Court whereof:

> "THE CASE IS OF SUCH IMPERATIVE PUBLIC IMPORTANCE AS TO JUSTIFY THE DEVIATION FROM NORMAL APPELLATE PROCESSES AND TO REQUIRE IMMEDIATE SETTLEMENT IN THIS COURT."

AND/OR AMENDMENT SIX, as pled previously against delay against both parties of case HSC No. 6102; AND/OR AMENDMENT EIGHT against "cruel and unusual punishment"; AND/OR AMENDMENT THIRTEEN against "involuntary servitude" by a "trust agreement", which involved a forced loan at no interest for lender against the "trustees" and "enslavers" getting compensation as "trustees" for no actual work performed; AND/OR AMENDMENT FOURTEEN for FREEDOM; AND/OR AMENDMENT NINETEEN and AMENDMENT TWENTY-SEVEN for EQUALITY FOR WOMEN.

Also, may Petitioner Appellant's Pleadings for the "Supplement to Joint Petition" please be considered; as a Supplement to Joint Petition, excusing inadvertant mistake as Pleadings for a Supplement; or Pleadings as a "Motion for Amendment" of Joint Petition, for This Court to re-

POOR COPY

member Appellant Pro Se's intentions as GOOD for proper Petition or Pleadings.

For, to this date, Petitioner Appellant Pro Se has talked to about 120 (one hundred twenty) lawyers of the Hawaii Bar Association, referred to by Hawaii's Lawyer Referral Service or other lawyers and none would help Appellant for favorable completion of all cases for Appellant for MERIT FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS PLED FOR SAME PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE FOR REASONABLE RESTITUTION AS REMEDY TO SET AN EXAMPLE against damages incurred by *any* Respondents-Appellees, whereof Appellant has, through 56 (fifty-six) months vicious delay in Hawaii's Courts lost credit and about $50,000 from unrecovered alimony which at present is less than half of fixed expenses, as pled on numerous occasions (APP. "E.III") through Respondents-Appellees Deprivation of income and all American Legal Rights for Petitioner Appellant Pre Se against the coercion for non-assertion of all Legal American Rights for Income for same Appellant, whereof this coercion for non-assertion even extended into Hawaii's Courts, as evidenced by the clerks' violation of Appellant's Legal American Rights, hereby appended as APPENDIX "D.III", as an example of one of at least 15 (fifteen) "Motions" the clerks refused to file without probable cause or REASON for APPELLANT PRO SE'S APPEAL FOR EQUITABLE SETTLEMENTS FOR A GOOD WOMAN AS APPELLANT AND TO SET THIS GOOD PRECEDENT FROM HAWAII FOR COMPLETE SETTLEMENT FOR A CAPABLE AMERICAN WOMAN JANICE CHING YEE AS SAME APPELLANT, WHO NEVER COMMITTED ADULTERY, DELIBERATE CRIME, OR DELIBERATE SIN, as "enslavement" and/or oppression.

PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE hereby prays for This Supreme Court of America to Grant this Appeal and Petition as Well as Appeal for Complete Summary Judgment for Judgment on the Pleadings for same Appellant to set this GOOD PRECEDENT FROM HAWAII, who has not set good legal precedents for a long time FOR AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AGAINST THE PUBLIC DANGER OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDGMENTS by Hawaii's lower Courts' bad Precedent,

which invoked the Jurisdiction of This Supreme Court, wherefore This Supreme Court can settle this important question, and FOR THIS, PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE DOES THANK THE SUPREME COURT OF AMERICA.

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
PETITIONER APPELLANT
PRO SE

3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

Dated June 11, 1976.

NO. 75-1429

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1975

CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER APPELLANT PRO SE

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge, strict adherence of the grounds specified, wherefore this "Joint Petition for Rehearing for Joint Petition for Writ of Certiorari" will be served for this day of June 11, 1976, on:

EDWARD Y.C. CHUN of
CHUN, KERR, & DODD
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, ET AL,
at: Suite 1408, AmFac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813

WILLIAM MCCORRISTON of
GOODSILL, ANDERSON, & QUINN
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
EDWARD Y.C. CHUN, ET AL,
at: 1600 Castle & Cooke Buiilding
Financial Plaza
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

WILLIAM L. FLEMING of
CADES, SCHUTTE, FLEMING & WRIGHT
Attorney for Respondents-Appellees:
ROBERT HOGAN, ET AL;
HAROLD NICKELSEN, ET AL:
JAMES KOSHIBA &/or the HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION,
at: 165 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RONALD AMEMIYA (694) and
NELSON CHANG (726)
Attorney General and Deputy for Respondents-Appellees:
GERRY NAGAHISA, ET AL; and/or
DR. BETTY ADAMS, ET AL,
AND/OR:
JUDGE B.M. VITOUSEK, ET AL; and/or
JUDGE NORITO KAWAKAMI
at: HAWAII STATE CAPITOL
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

MAX GARCIA
Attorney for Respondent-Appellee:
ROBERT FRANKLIN
at: Suite 990 Pacific Trade Center 190 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

STANLEY KANETAKE
Attorney for Respondent-Appellee
STEPHANIE KOKERNAK
at: 228 Kuulei Road
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
Petitioner Appellant Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff–Appellant,	)	MOTION FOR
	)	AMENDMENT TO
v.	)	INCLUDE ALL
	)	ADDITIONAL
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE	)	RECORD ON
and/or	)	APPEAL FOR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES,	)	CONSIDERATION
	)	
Defendants–Appellees.	)	
	)	

FILED
1976 JUN 7 AM 11:09
/s/ Darrell N. Phillips
CLERK SUPREME COURT

ORDER

APPENDIX "A-III"

POOR COPY

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE	)
	) MOTION FOR
v.	) AMENDMENT TO
	) INCLUDE ALL
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE,	) ADDITIONAL
and/or	) RECORD ON
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES	) APPEAL FOR
	) CONSIDERATION
Defendants–Appellees.	)
	)

ORDER

Appellant's "Motion For Amendment to Include All Additional Record on Appeal for Consideration", filed on May 21, 1976, is hereby denied for lack of specificity and the failure of movant to show that there are additional records to which she is entitled.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, June 7, 1976.

BY THE COURT:
/s/ William S. Richardson

CHIEF JUSTICE

SEAL

APPENDIX "A-III"

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE

MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE ALL ADDITIONAL RECORD ON APPEAL FOR CONSIDERATION

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW AND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE

I hereby certify a copy of this Motion will be served on:

APPENDIX "AA III"

POOR COPY

Edward Chun, et al, Attorneys
for: Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al
Defendants–Appellees
at: 1408 Amfac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813

for this day of May 21, 1976

FILED
1976 MAY 21 PM 4:26
/s/ Clement J. H. Chun
CLERK SUPREME COURT

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees.	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) Judge)

MOTION FOR AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE ALL ADDITIONAL RECORD ON APPEAL FOR CONSIDERATION

Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se hereby Motions for Amendment, according to *Rule 15 of Hawaii's Rules of Civil Procedure* to include all additional Record on Appeal against the lower Family Court, whereof "Justice so requires" for conformity to the evidence for Merits for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, who hereby Appeals against the Unequitable Judgments of the Lower Family Court Re: Monetary Distributions for Settlement and/or Child Custody.

The Jurisdiction of Hawaii's Supreme Court to Hear and Grant Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se's Motion, reside on *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES, RULE 1(a)(1); HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 602-5, 605-2, and/or 657-20* against Concealment of Prejudiced Persecution by Delay as

POOR COPY

Harassment for Coercion of Non-assertion of Legal Constitutional Rights for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se against Unconstitutional Violation of the *UNITED STATES' CONSTITUTION'S AMENDMENTS, AMENDMENT ONE, AMENDMENT FOUR, AMENDMENT SIX, AMENDMENT EIGHT, AMENDMENT THIRTEEN, AMENDMENT FOURTEEN, AMENDMENT NINETEEN, AND AMENDMENT TWENTY-SEVEN,* as previously discussed in earlier pleadings for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se.

Also, *Hawaii's REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24,* for initiative and/or prerogative of This Court's Justices to include and consider all Additional Record on Appeal for Pleadings for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se; also for *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 75 and/or Rule 15,* where "the Court may allow" all of "the pleadings to be amended and shall do so freely" "by leave of the Court" "and leave shall be freely given when Justice so requires"; *Rule 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, &/or 6)* against the lower Family Court, who were in Unconstitutional Error thereby requiring this supplemental or additional Record to be filed and therefore on Appeal for Relief of Judgement, and/or *Rule 73,* AND/OR *THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION* AND ALL OF ITS PERTINENT *AMENDMENTS* AS NOTED, OR DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Dated May 21, 1976.

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE)

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW AND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se hereby Motions for Amendment, according to *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 15*, to include all additional Record on Appeal against the lower Family Court, whereof "Justice" for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se "so requires", and according to the Jurisdiction of Hawaii's Supreme Court, as previously noted, whereof This Supreme Court's Denial of Motion for Amendment, filed March 23, 1976, by Order filed March 31, 1976, is "contrary to the evidence" for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee, who hereby asks for all of same Appellant's Pleadings and/or transcripts to be included in the Record of Appeal for HSC case #6102, for "Justice" for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se "so requires"; and according to Rule 75, specifically Rule 75(d),

POOR COPY

"the Supreme Court on proper suggestion or of its own initiative, may direct that the omission" of HSC #5930, which, and HSC #6102, together are part and parcel of case FC–D 81258, to include HSC #5930, so this "omission" can "be corrected" for the Record on Appeal.

AND/OR the defamatory Psychiatrist Dr. Betty Adams' "severe chronic mental illness" Report, was a Malicious, Slanderous Misstatement, to say the least, and can Hawaii's Supreme Court please Order Striking this "misstatement" so it can "be corrected"; and/or social worker Gerry Nagahisa's defamatory erroneous misstatement of "behavior does not relate to the children" for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, who likes Tuesday as a good day for same Appellant Janice Ching Yee against Nagahisa's "Tuesday is a bad day", a misstatement which should "be corrected".

Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se hereby pleads to Hawaii's Supreme Court to certify and/or correct this supplemental Record of the lower Courts errors, for the Record on Appeal for HSC #6102.

I cannot understand why the clerks of the Supreme Court won't accept the Record on Appeal from the lower Family Court unless a Motion is made for inclusion.

Also, will Hawaii's Supreme Court please Order Relief of Judgement for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se's Motion, dated April 21, 1976, which is unfiled; and can This Court Order it filed for it is a proper Motion, for "Justice so requires" for Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se, who has not had any "justice" in Hawaii's Courts.

May This Court please be informed that this Motion is Moved previous to a Reply Brief for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, who hereby thanks This Court for the consideration of proper procedure for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se for Merits of Pleadings for Amendment to Include all Additional Record on Appeal for Consideration.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se

Dated May 21, 1976

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE)

AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE

I am Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se of 3169 Alika Avenue of Honolulu, Hawaii, (96817), and being duly sworn and under oath, swear, and affirm that all of my "unprofessional" Legal Pleadings are pled in good faith and/or with good intentions, for a fast determination of this case.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se

Subscribed and sworn to
this 21st day of May, 1976.
/s/ George Ilalaole
Notary Public, First Judicial
Circuit, State of Hawaii
My commission expres Oct. 10, 1978

BEST COPY

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE

MORE COMPREHENSIVE AFFIDAVIT OF
JANICE CHING YEE FOR OPENING BRIEF

I hereby certify two (2) copies of this Affidavit will be served on:

Edward Chun, et al, Attorneys
for: Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al,
Defendants–Appellees
at: 1408 Amfac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813

for this day of June 7, 1976.

FILED
1976 JUN 7 AM 8:51
/s/ Clement J. H. Chun
CLERK SUPREME COURT

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

APPENDIX "B III"

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE)

MORE COMPREHENSIVE AFFIDAVIT
OF
JANICE CHING YEE

STATE OF HAWAII)
) SS:
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

COMES NOW, JANICE CHING YEE, whereof being duly sworn on oath deposes and says:

1. She resides in Honolulu, Hawaii, and pleads as Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, ex-wife of Alfred Alphonse Yee whereof she married Alfred A. Yee on January 29, 1953, once whereby Defendant–Appellee Alfred Alphonse Yee was drawing a salary

POOR COPY

of $250.00 a month or $3000.00 a year as an engineer at the Navy Yard in Pearl Harbor.

2. That in 1954, she once helped Alfred Yee start a private business from a starting salary of $2000.00 a year.

3. That she worked hard once as a silent partner of Alfred Yee's from 1953 until 1973, whereby she once helped build up the name of Alfred Alphonse Yee and the company Alfred A. Yee and Associates from its incorporation in June, 1960 after working as a silent partner for Alfred Yee for Park & Yee from 1954 until 1960.

4. That on February 12, 1973, Final Absolute Divorce was granted for irreconcileable differences caused by fear of physical violence by Defendant–Appellee, wherefore it was filed March 1, 1973, wherefore Alfred Alphonse Yee's salary at moment of divorce was $105,000.00+ per year, wherefor Janice Ching Yee helped Alfred A. Yee make this sum; once as a silent partner of a marriage of 20 legal years and five (5) legitimate children before final absolute divorce, not being appealed.

5. That Affiant hereby pleads as Plaintiff–Appellant Janice C. Yee for more equitable settlement for this divorce for half of income or Alfred Yee's salary at moment of divorce or $50,000.00+ per year, multiplied by another 54 years of living to 100 years if possible:

$50,000.	per year
x54	years to live
$2,700,000.	for potential income once worked for
300,000.	for potential income from acceleration of good groundwork for the business
$3,000,000.	for COMPLETE SETTLEMENT AS PLED FOR
	PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE

6. That Affiant divorced Defendant–Appellee, Alfred Alphonse Yee, who subtley coerced the divorce by coercing attempted suicide in 1968.

7. That, in 1971, Alfred A. Yee hired a maid Stephanie Kokernak, who was the tool which coerced the divorce by refusing to leave after being told she was detrimental to the health of Affiant, who pled as Plaintiff–Appellant against Kokernak's deliberate Unconstitutional Invasion of Privacy.

8. That Affiant retained ex-lawyer Robert Hogan as counsel, which was a terrible mistake, for Robert Hogan was Malicious, malfeasant, malevolent, and a fraud for breach of con-

tract wherefore Robert Hogan's malice neglected to appeal "de novo" against the Court Psychiatrist Dr. Betty Adams, whose perjured "severe chronic mental illness" report was defamatory, libelous, and slanderous, and/or Social Worker Gerry Nagahisa's perjured report, AND/OR Robert Hogan neglected to appeal for custody of the children to Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee, real Mother of the children, once it was lost to Defendant–Appellee, whose attorney Edward Chun, et al, conducted a malicious defense by slow, torturous delay as harassment and provokement for mental and financial injury of Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se as Affiant against the malicious "guardian ad litem" order instigated by Judge Betty Vitousek and Edward Chun, et al, and perpetrated by them for Defendant–Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, wherefor Affiant's ex-attorney Robert Hogan's malfeasant misconduct neglected to appeal against the void "guardian ad litem", illegal Harold Nickelsen, who didn't have the decency to decline this unconstitutional "false arrest" by Judge Vitousek, whose malice and Robert Hogan's malice was reported to the Hawaii Bar Association's Ethics Commission, whereby then Committee Chairman James E. Koshiba called Unethical Robert Hogan's doings "Ethical", which made James E. Koshiba's position unethical if he couldn't differentiate between non-ethics or ethics OR wouldn't.

9. That Affiant, after talking to more than 50 lawyers by then, hired Robert Franklin who said he could sue Robert Hogan, so Hogan was fired; but Robert Franklin's conflict was fraud and breach of contract, whereby instead of suing Robert Hogan, after two weeks, Robert Franklin retained Robert Hogan as attorney for Robert Franklin's divorce, which embarrassment Judge Betty Vitousek refused to eliminate by letting Robert Franklin be discharged as ex-attorney for Plaintiff–Appellant.

10. That Judge B. M. Vitousek's unconstitutional Judgements were strung out for twelve supplemental decisions and four (4) other decisions which were for prejudicial persecution for deprivation of income and legal rights for Affiant as Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se and who Appeals against the Unequitable Judgements of the lower Family Court Re: Monetary Distributions for Settlement and/or Custody of the Children to Mother Janice C. Yee against the enslaving "trust agreement" or "trustees" which are a detriment as enslavers which is Unconstitutional, for Affiant does not want to work

POOR COPY

for Alfred A. Yee & Associates or loan them anything, since Alfred A. Yee does owe Affiant Janice Yee $200,000. as a sum once borrowed and decreed to be repaid as part of the financial settlement or Complete Settlement of $3 million for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se for this real money once worked for from twenty (20) years of work, not to forget some pleasure, for basic groundwork for Alfred A. Yee & Associates for propulsion of this engineering company for Alfred A. Yee, who can pay Janice Yee, Affiant as Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se the $200,000. as fast temporary relief until final Complete Settlement for same Appellant for equitable settlement of $3 million.

11. That Affiant APPEALS to This Court to GRANT THIS APPEAL ABOVE SO SAME APPELLANT CAN SET A GOOD PRECEDENT FOR HAWAII FOR A GOOD CAPABLE WOMAN AS PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE WHO NEVER COMMITTED ADULTERY, CRIME, OR DELIBERATE SIN.

12. That Affiant wants to live as a good independant American woman who Appeals for Custody of the Children to Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se as well.

13. That Affiant talked to more than 120 lawyers referred to by the Lawyers' Referral Service or other lawyers and they refused to help Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, so I am not opposed to This Court appointing a lawyer to help Affiant.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOUGHT.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Affiant (Plaintiff–Appellant

Subscribed and sworn to
this 7th day of June, 1976.
/s/ Sydney T. Kan
Notary Public, First Judicial
Circuit, State of Hawaii
My Commission Expires May 31, 1980.

BLEED THROUGH

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs.	) APPEAL AGAINST THE) LOWER COURTS' JUDGE-) MENTS FOR DENIAL OF) REMEDY FOR PLAINTIFF) AGAINST CONSPIRATORS*) NAMED FOR DEPRIVA-) TION OF INCOME & LEGAL) RIGHTS FOR PLAINTIFF
ROBERT HOGAN, ET AL, (NO. 5971)	) CIVIL NO. 44240
ROBERT FRANKLIN, (NO. 5949)	) CIVIL NO.44578
HAROLD NICKELSEN, ET AL, (NO. 5969)	) CIVIL NO.44244
BETTY VITOUSEK, JUDGE, ET AL (NO. 6008)	) CIVIL NO.45123
JAMES KOSHIBA &/OR THE HBA‡ (NO. 5970)	) CIVIL NO.44262
BETTY ADAMS, ET AL, &/OR GERRY NAGAHISA, ET AL, (NO. 5924)	) CIVIL NO.44263
STEPHANIE KOKERNAK, (NO. 5943)	) CIVIL NO.44869
Defendan(s)–Appellee(s)	) -

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE APPEALS AGAINST CONSPIRACY FOR PREJUDICED PERSECUTION BY MALICIOUS ABUSE OF JUDICIAL PROCESS FOR DEPRIVATION OF INCOME AND LEGAL RIGHTS FOR PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT;
MOTION FOR JUDGEMENT ON THE PLEADINGS;
MEMORANDUMS OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT

‡ HBA = HAWAII BAR ASSOCIATION

FILED
1975 DEC. 5 PM 2:03
/s/ Clement J. H. Chun
CLERK SUPREME COURT

APPENDIX "C(3)(III)"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

I hereby certify that a copy of the following motions have been served on the individual attorneys for the separate Defendant(s)–Appellee(s) by certified mail from the U. S. post office at Honolulu, Hawaii, properly addressed and postage prepaid, this 5th day of December, 1975.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

April 21, 1976

HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT JUSTICES RE: HSC #6102,
HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT YEE vs YEE
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Sirs:

This Motion can be filed upon Order by the Chief Justice or the Justices, as fast as the Justices Order the Amended Notice of Appeal and/or Designation of Record, filed April 9. 1976, for case HSC #6102, to be sent up from the lower Circuit Court. (EXHIBIT "III").

The Jurisdiction for this can be found in *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 15*, for Amendment for "justice so requires", *Rule 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 6); HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24*, for the Justices' prerogative and/or initiative, AND/OR *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES, Rule 1(a) (1)*, and/or *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES' CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EC7-22 and/or EC7-21.*

With Respect for Real Justice,

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

APPROVED

JUSTICE, HAWAII SUPREME COURT

APPENDIX "D III"

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE

MOTION FOR RELIEF OF JUDGMENT AND/OR AMENDMENT OF OPENING BRIEF TO CONFORM TO THE EVIDENCE; MEMORANDUMS OF LAW, ARGUMENTS, AND EXHIBITS; AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE

I hereby certify a copy of this Motion will be served on:
EDWARD CHUN, ET AL, Attorneys
for: ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, ET AL,
Defendants–Appellees
at: 1408 Amfac Bldg. 700 Bishop St., Hon. HI 96813
for this day of April 21, 1976

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL
No. 134717
(Chun for Al Yee)
Date: April 21, 1976

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE

MOTION FOR RELIEF OF JUDGMENT AND/OR AMENDMENT OF OPENING BRIEF TO CONFORM TO THE EVIDENCE

Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se hereby Motions for Relief of Judgment and/or Amendment of Opening Brief for case HSC #6102, according to *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 6) and/or Rule 15(b),* for conformity to the evidence for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, to include, for consideration, the filed (in lower Family Court of Hawaii's Circuit Court) "Motion (exhibit "I") to Strike Vitousek's latest Twelfth Supplemental Decision" (the Court Records), as pertinent evidence of Judge B. Vitousek's Malicious Malfeasant Unconstitutional Judicial "financial enslavement" as "involuntary servitude" decisions for Deprivation of Legal Rights for income for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, Janice Ching Yee.

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

Also, for these Motions for Relief and/or Amendment to include Reconsideration of previous "Motion for Amendment", which was filed March 23, 1976, according to *Chapter 657-20 of HAWAII'S REVISED STATUES*, against Concealment of Judge Betty Vitousek's Malice for Deprivation of Legal Rights for income for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee.

The Jurisdiction of This Hawaii's Supreme Court to hear and Grant Plaintiff–Appellant's Motions, reside on *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES, Rule 1(a)(1); HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES' CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS' EC7-22 and/or EC7-21; HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 602-5, Chapter 605-2, Chapter 657-20* against Concealment of Unconstitutional Deprivation of Legal Rights against Judicial "financial enslavement" or Judicial "involuntary servitude", *Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24*, for the initiative and/or prerogative of the Justices to do this; *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 15*, where "the Court may allow the pleadings to be amended and shall do so freely" "by leave of the court" "and leave shall be freely given when justice so requires", *Rule 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 6)* for Relief of Judgment, and/or *Rule 73*, AND/OR *THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL OF ITS PERTINENT AMENDMENTS.*

The Jurisdiction of This Court resides, in addition, on "Notice of Second Amendment of Appeal", filed April 9, 1976, and "Designation of Record for This Second Amendment of Appeal", filed April 9, 1976, hereby appended as "EXHIBIT III".

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

Dated, April 21, 1976.

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE)

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW, ARGUMENTS, AND EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se hereby Motions for Amendment of Opening Brief for case HSC #6102, according to *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 15(b);* to include for consideration, the filed (April 8, 1976) "Motion to Strike Vitousek's Twelfth Supplemental Decision" (EXHIBIT "I"); for conformity to the evidence for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se against Prejudiced Persecution which Judge Betty Vitousek stubbornly effects by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process by Coercion of Non-assertion of Legal Rights for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee as ex-wife of Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, Defendants–Appellees, of twenty (20) years of marriage and five (5) legitimate children AND/OR against Defendants–Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al's

POOR COPY
NO PAGE NUMBER

blatant Conspiracy for Coercion of non-assertion of Plaintiff–Appellant's American Constitutional Rights for FREEDOM against Judicial "financial enslavement" or "involuntary servitude" which is Oppression, which is Unconstitutional against the

†*UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENTS*: (in particular)

1. *FIRST AMENDMENT*: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

2. *FOURTH AMENDMENT*: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and **no warrants** shall issue, but upon probable cause, (?) supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

3. *SIXTH AMENDMENT*: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused (what about aggrieved?) shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation (against Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se against "false arrest" restraintive "guardian ad litem" or "trustee"); to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witness in his favor (EXHIBIT "II"), and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense (what about "prosecutor" Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se as aggrieved party?)

4. *EIGHTH AMENDMENT*: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, **nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.**"

5. *THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT*: "*Section 1.* Neither **slavery nor involuntary servitude**, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly

†WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA (vol. #19), 1971, page 141–145.

convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their Jurisdiction.
Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by legislation."

6. *FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT:* "*Section 1.* All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the Jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; **nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.**"
"*Sections 2, 3, 4*" included, but not specified.
"*Section 5.* The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

7. *NINETEENTH AMENDMENT:* "*Section 1.* The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."
"*Section 2.* Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

May this Motion be considered now for a fast determination of this case HSC #6102 for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se against any further delay as Harassment for mental and financial injury of Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, who hereby Appeals to Hawaii's Supreme Court to Reconsider Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" of Appellant's March 23, 1976 "Motion to Amend Opening Brief", which should not have been denied on March 31, 1976 at 3:26 p.m., for it was evidence of the lower Family Court's Prejudiced Judicial Persecution by Judicial "financial enslavement" and Judicial "involuntary servitude" against Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se.

Plaintiff–Appellant hereby Appeals to Hawaii's Supreme Court to Grant same Appellant Pro Se's Appeal and Order Complete Settlement for $3 million for Plaintiff–Appellant Janice Ching Yee for same Appellant Pro Se's REAL records, wherefor Appellant more than deserves custody of the children to Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, who never committed adultery, crime, or deliberate sin as false witnesses against Plaintiff–

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

Appellant Pro Se for inclusion of signatures (EXHIBIT 'II") of affirmation of faith of Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee as a capable American woman, wherefor This Hawaii's Supreme Court **can** direct a new Judgment or Order, according to *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24*, to Strike Nagahisa, et al, and/or Strike Adams, et al's Defamatory False Evidence and Report, in its entirety, AND/OR Reverse Judge Betty Vitousek's Decision for a "trustee" and/or "trust agreement", which is "involuntary financial servitude" and again evidence **for** Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se against Defendants–Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, Edward Chun, et al, Defendants–Appellees' attorneys, and/or the lower Family Court Judge Betty Vitousek, who is against the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ITS AMENDMENTS FOR **FREEDOM** for Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee for custody of the children, for the REAL record, to same Appellant for Complete Settlement as Judgment on the Pleadings, according to *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 12(c)*, for the sum of $3 million for same Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee who hereby thanks This Supreme Court of Hawaii for its initiative where it can direct a new Judgment or new Order for same Appellant Pro Se.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

Dated, April 12, 1976.

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants–Appellees	) FC–D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST) THE UNEQUITABLE) JUDGMENTS OF) THE LOWER) FAMILY COURT) RE: MONETARY) DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT) AND/OR CHILD) CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT) COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M.) Vitousek) JUDGE)

AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF–APPELLANT PRO SE

I am Mrs. Janice Ching Yee of 3169 Alika Avenue, Honolulu Hawaii, (96817), and being duly sworn and under oath swear and affirm that all of my "unprofessional" LEGAL PLEADINGS, including ALL PLEADINGS, are pled in good faith and/or with good intentions, for I hereby will uphold the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se

Subscribed and sworn this
12th day of April, 1976.
/s/George Ilalaole
Notary Public, First Judicial
Circuit, State of Hawaii
My commission expires Oct. 10, 1978.

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
Telephone: 595-3426

PLAINTIFF PRO SE

1st CIRCUIT COURT
STATE OF HAWAII
FILED
1976 APRIL 8
PM 3:04
/s/ S. IKEDA
CLERK

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants.	) FC–D No. 81258)) MOTION TO STRIKE) VITOUSEK'S) TWELFTH SUPPLE-) MENTAL DECISION) AND ORDER;) EXHIBIT IN SUP-) PORT OF MOTION;) AFFIDAVIT OF) PLAINTIFF PRO SE;) CERTIFICATE OF) SERVICE;) STIPULATION FOR) NON-HEARING.

MOTION TO STRIKE VITOUSEK'S TWELFTH SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION & ORDER

Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se hereby Motions to Strike Vitousek's Twelfth Supplemental Decision; and/or Remand the case FC–D, #81258 to Hawaii's Supreme Court in conformity to the evidence of case FC–D #81258, being appealed as case HSC #6102, whereby it is pending appeal against the "Unequitable Terms of the Final Absolute Divorce Decree and Child Custody", whereby this can be done, according to *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 641-4 and/or Chapter 641-24.*

Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se hereby Motions, according to *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 12(f),* against insufficient defense or judgement, or impertinent, or

EXHIBIT "I"

(motion only – Exhibits and Affidavits, etc. not included)

BLEED THROUGH

scandalous matter by Judge B. M. Vitousek for insinuated incompetancy, which is Conflict as Prejudiced Persecution by Defamatory Contributory Conspiracy for the Defendants, Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al's cause for Coerced ignominy by Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se for FREEDOM as LEGAL **CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS** FOR PLAINTIFF (APPELLANT) PRO SE, FOR ITS *FIRST AMENDMENT*.

May inclusion of all pleadings, as pled, for Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se, for Complete Settlement, include the signed "Petition" or Exhibit "G" in Support of Plaintiff's "original "Complaint", hereby presented again as an exhibit of good faith of friends for Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se as a person and for same Plaintiff's character as capable Janice Ching Yee against Defamation instigated and perpetrated by Judge B. M. Vitousek and/or Conspirators*.

Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se hereby requests further pleadings to be remanded to Hawaii's Supreme Court; as case HSC #6102; to conform to all pleadings for this case FC–D #81258 on Appeal as HSC #6102 wherefor Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se can do nought else but thank Judge B. M. Vitousek and this Court for the trouble it must have gone to for its decisions, although not in agreement with Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se for Complete Settlement and Custody of the Children to Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se Janice Ching Yee.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se

Dated, April 8, 1976.

* Alfred A. Yee, et al, HSC #6102
Stephanie Kokernak, HSC #5943 – USSC, pending
Robert Hogan, et al, HSC #5971 – USSC, pending
Edward Chun, et al, HSC #5903 – USSC #75–1143
Dr. Betty Adams, et al, &/or Gerry Nagahisa, et al, HSC #5924 – USSC, pending
Harold Nickelsen, et al, HSC #5969 – USSC, pending
James Koshiba &/or the Hawaii Bar Association, HSC #5970 – USSC, pending
Robert Franklin, HSC #5949 – USSC, pending
Judge B. M. Vitousek, HSC #6008 – USSC, pending

EXHIBIT "I"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

PETITION
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

I am against Judge Betty Vitousek's "guardian ad litem" and/or "trustee" decisions for Mrs. Janice Ching Yee.

This is to confirm that Mrs. Janice Ching Yee has always been competant and able to think of her own free will and has never been harmful to anybody.

She has always spoken with competance or in a normal manner.

**SIGNED:

1. D. C. Fuller
2. Martha Nieves
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible]
5. [illegible]
6. Marie Lee
7. Jane Chun Kau
8. [illegible]
9. Lau Lin Ching
10. [illegible]
11. Mrs B. Hopper
12. [illegible]
13. N Zane
14. [illegible]
15. A. C. Ting
16. Virginia W Kodl
17. [illegible]
18. Faith Ishii
19. Hazel Yee
20. [illegible]
21. [illegible]
22. [illegible]
23. [illegible]
24. [illegible]
25. [illegible]
26. Betty Lou Ritch
27. [illegible] (E. Meyers)
28. Velma Neale Clark
29. Marianne C Mee

**For Aug. 4, 1975 "Additional Argument in Support of Complaint", etc., for Civil No. 45123 (Vitousek, et al) (HSC #6008)

EXHIBIT "II"
(APPENDIX "YEA")

BLEED THROUGH

1ST CIRCUIT COURT
STATE OF HAWAII
FILED
1976 APRIL 9 PM 12:56
/s/ R. S. YAMADA
CLERK

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
Telephone: 595 3426

PLAINTIFF FOR PLAINTIFF PRO SE

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE, & ASSOCIATES, Defendants.	FC–D No. 81258 NOTICE OF SECOND AMENDMENT OF APPEAL; DESIGNATION OF RECORD FOR SECOND AMENDMENT OF APPEAL AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF (REAFFIRMATION) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

NOTICE OF SECOND AMENDMENT OF APPEAL

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN for a Second Amendment of Appeal, according to *Rule 15(b)* to conform to its evidence whereby it's time the complete case FC–D No. 81258, including all Supplemental Decisions and/or various Orders should be appealed to Hawaii's Supreme Court whereof the lower Family Court's Twelfth Supplemental Decision was filed April 7, 1976 at 4:31 p.m.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN for this Second Amendment of Appeal, according to *Rule 16(b)* of *HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE* to include Appeal against all Supplemental Decisions or Orders which are Prejudiced Malicous Abuse of

EXHIBIT "III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

Judicial Process for Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se.

The Jurisdiction for this Second Amendment of Appeal resides on *FAMILY COURT RULES, Rule 91(a); HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 73, Rule 15(b),* and/or *RULE 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 6); HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 605-2, Chapter 602-5, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24, AND/OR Chapter 657-1 and/or 657-20* for extension of the Statutes of Limitations against Malice for Conspiracy for Coerced Ignominy by Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights against Defamation, Libel, and Slander; *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES, Rule 16.1 and/or 16.2,* AND/OR *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES' CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EC7-21 and/or EC7-22.*

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se

Dated, April 9, 2976.

BLEED THROUGH

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
Telephone: 595 3426

PLAINTIFF PRO SE FOR PLAINTIFF

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants.	) FC–D No. 81258)) DESIGNATION OF) RECORD FOR) THIS SECOND) AMENDMENT) OF APPEAL

DESIGNATION OF RECORD FOR THIS SECOND AMENDMENT OF APPEAL

Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se hereby DESIGNATES AS THE RECORD ON APPEAL, the COMPLETE RECORD of all Transcripts and File of Proceedings in FC–D No. 81258, and ALL RECORDS for the previous Appeal for this case, recorded as case HSC #5930, to be included.

The Jurisdiction for this Second Amendment of Appeal resides on *FAMILY COURT RULES, Rule 91(a); HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 73, Rule 15(b), and/or Rule 60(b) (1, 2, 3, 4, and/or 6); HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES, Chapter 605-2, Chapter 602-5, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24, And/Or Chapter 657-1 or 657-20 for extension; HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES, Rule 16.1 and/or 16.2; AND/OR HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES' CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EC7-21 and/or EC7-22.*

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se

EXHIBIT "III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
Telephone 595 3426

PLAINTIFF PRO SE FOR PLAINTIFF

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, Defendants.	) FC–D No. 81258)) AFFIDAVIT) OF) PLAINTIFF

AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF (APPELLANT) PRO SE

I am Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se, of 3169 Alika Avenue of Honolulu, Hawaii, (96817), and being duly sworn and under oath, swear, and affirm that all of my "unprofessional" Legal Pleadings are pled in good faith and/or with good intentions, for a fast determination of this case.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 23rd day of February, 1976.
/s/ Anne Osenburg
Notary Public, First Judicial
Circuit, State of Hawaii
My commission expires Oct. 15, 1978

EXHIBIT "III"

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify a copy of this Notice of Second Amendment of Appeal, and Affidavit (Reaffirmed), was served on:

Attorney Edward Chun, et al, for:
Defendants (Appellees) Alfred Alphonse Yee et al,
at: CHUN, KERR & DODD
14th Floor, Amfac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813

this 9th day of April, 1976, for case FC–D No. 81258.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff (Appellant) Pro Se

EXHIBIT "III"

May 24, 1976

JUSTICES OF HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT
HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

Dear Sirs: RE *HSC No. 6102, YEE vs. YEE*

Please Order that Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se's "Reply Brief; or in the alternative, Motion to Strike Appellees Motion to Dismiss", filed, for it is a proper document; and therefore the clerks are in Violation of my Legal Rights to Assert my Rights to have it filed for fast determination of case HSC No. 6102.

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

APPROVED

_____
JUSTICE

APPENDIX "E III"

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE and/or ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES Defendants-Appellees.	) FC-D No. 81258)) APPEAL AGAINST THE) UNEQUITABLE JUDGMENTS) OF THE LOWER FAMILY COURT RE: MONETARY DISTRIBUTIONS) FOR SETTLEMENT AND/OR) CHILD CUSTODY)) FIRST CIRCUIT COURT) FAMILY COURT) Honorable Betty M. Vitousek

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF; OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE MOTION TO STRIKE APPELLEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS, ETC.

AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE

I hereby certify two (2) copies of this Brief or Motion will be served on:
Edward Chun, et al, Attorneys
for: Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al,
Defendants-Appellees
at: 1408 Amfac Building
700 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
for this day of May 22, 1976.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED	4
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND POINTS TO BE RELIED ON	5
IV. ARGUMENTS	8
V. CONCLUSION	12
AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE	
APPENDICES: "A"	
"B"	
"C"	
"D"	
"E"	
"F"	
"G"	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	page
HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES:	2
Chapter:	
602-5	3
605-2	3
634-20	2,3
641-4	4
641-24	4
657-20	3,8
HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:	2
Rule:	
12(c)	13
12(f)	8
26	8
56(a)	13
73	4
75	4
75(d)	3,8
HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES:	
Rule:	
1(a)(1)	4
1(d)	3
3(b)(3)	4,5
3(b)(4)	5
3(b)(5)	5
3(b)(7)	5
3(f)	13
16.1	4
16.2	4
EC2-30	7
EC7-21	7
EC7-22	7
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND AMENDMENTS:	2,4,8,11
AMENDMENTS:	
1	4,8,11
4	4,9,11
6	4,9,11
8	4,9,11,13

13 4,9,11,13
14 4,9,11,13
19 4,10
27 4
5 4

WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA
(vol. #19), 1971, p. 141-145 8

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1975

JANICE CHING YEE	)	FC-D No. 81258
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
Pro Se,	)	APPEAL AGAINST THE
	)	UNEQUITABLE JUDG-
vs.	)	MENTS OF THE LOWER
	)	FAMILY COURT RE:
	)	MONETARY DISTRIBU-
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE	)	TIONS FOR SETTLEMENT
	)	AND/OR
and/or	)	CHILD CUSTODY
ALFRED A. YEE &	)	
ASSOCIATES	)	
Defendants-Appellees.	)	FIRST CIRCUIT COURT
	)	Honorable Betty M. Vitousek
	)	Judge _____

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF; OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO STRIKE APPELLEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

I. *STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION* *Plaintiff-Apellant Pro Se hereby Appeals to Hawaii's Supreme Court against the Unequitable Unconstitutional Judgments of the lower Family Court Re: Monetary Distributions for Settlement and Custody of the Children to Mother Janice Ching Yee, Plaintiff-Apellant Pro Se FOR* Final Absolute Divorce from ex-husband Alfred Alphonse Yee, Defendant-Appellee, filed March 1, 1973, as appended in the Opening Brief of HSC No. 6102. In addition and in reiteration, the original Notice of Appeal and Designation of Record was filed May 5, 1975, (the Court Record,* p. 474-475) and docketed on June 27, 1975, as Hawaii Supreme Court (HSC) case No. 5930, whereof the Opening Brief for HSC No. 5930 was filed on Aug. 26, 1975, and Dismissed for a Premature Appeal by Order of Hawaii's Supreme Court on Nov. 3, 1975. (APP. "B" of Opening Brief for HSC No. 6102). "Motion to Amend Opening Brief (HSC No. 5930) for Excusable Error or Neglect", filed Oct. 20, 1975, was denied Nov. 3, 1975, (APP. "C" of Opening Brief for HSC No. 6102) and should have been considered, according to *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES**, *Chapter 634.20*.

*hereafter referred to as *HRS*.

BLEED THROUGH

"Petition for Rehearing "was filed on Nov. 5, 1975, and denied on Nov. 17, 1975. (APP. "D" of Opening Brief, HSC No. 6102). The Second Notice of Appeal and Designation of Record was filed on Dec. 15, 1975, ("tCR", p. 568-570) and docketed on Jan. 29, 1976, as HSC No. 6102. Amended Designation of Record on Appeal was filed on Feb. 10, 1976, ("tCR", p. 612) to include HSC No. 5930 as part and parcel of the Records of HSC No. 6102, which is on Appeal for original case FC-D No. 81258. On Feb. 23, 1976, was filed Notice of Amendment of Appeal and Designation of Record for this Amendment of Appeal to include Appeal to Hawaii's Supreme Court against the lower Family Court Judge Vitousek's Eleventh Supplemental Decision, (APP. "E" of Opening Brief, HSC No. 6102) approving a complicated "enslaving" "trust agreement", instigated by Defendants-Appellees' Attorney Edward Chun, et al, whose malice conspired to conduct a malicious defense by delay as harassment and coercion for non-assertion of Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se against this Concealed Conspiracy for mental and financial "enslavement" as injury of Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, who again Appeals to Hawaii's Supreme Court against this Violation of Appellant's Rights, including *HAWAII'S RULES* and/or *STATUTES*, AND/OR the *CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES* and all *AMENDMENTS* FOR FREEDOM FOR PLAINTIFF-APELLANT PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE as a capable American Woman for MERITS for COMPLETE SETTLEMENT AS FREEDOM PLUS PERMANENT CUSTODY of the Children to THIS APPELLANT JANICE CHING YEE AS REAL MOTHER.

Additional Jurisdiction for Permanent Custody for Appellant was filed May 21, 1976, in the "Motion for Amendment" and will not be reiterated for reminder for This Court. May this Amendment also suffice for Amendment of Appeal against the lower Family Court's Unconstitutional Unequitable Judgments, as mentioned. May Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se urge This Supreme Court to please correct "misstatements" and/or "errors" in the Court Records and certify these corrections, according to *Rule 75(d) of HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**, and/or according to *HRS, Chapter 634-20* AND/OR *Chapter 657-20*, as pled for extension of time against Concealment of the lower Family Court's Fraud for Concealed Conflict for Concealed Prejudiced Persecution by Concealed Malicious

*hereafter referred to as *HR of CP*.

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

Abuse of Judicial Process for Coercion for Non-assertion of Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se against Concealed Coercion for Deprivation of Legal Rights for Income for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se. Will Hawaii's Supreme Court do this for strong confirmation for a rebirth of faith in Hawaii's Supreme Court, for this will be good for Hawaii. Notice of Second Amendment of Appeal and Designation of Record for This Second Amendment of Appeal against the lower Family Court's Twelfth Supplemental Decision and Order, filed Apr. 7, 1976, was filed Apr. 9, 1976, for conformity to the evidence against the lower Court's Prejudiced Unconstitutional Judgments against Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, as pled.

"Motion to Assign Original S.C. No. 5930 as the "Number" for case S.C. No. 6102" was denied, contrary to *SUPREME COURT RULES,*** *Rule 1(d)*, where even cross Appeals are docketed under numbers of the original appeal.

The Jurisdiction of Hawaii's Supreme Court to GRANT PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRE SE'S APPEAL, resides on *HAWAII'S REVISED STATUTES Chapter 605-2, Chapter 602-5, Chapter 657-20, Chapter 634-20, Chapter 641-4 and/or 641-24, HAWAII'S RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Rule 73 and/or Rule 75;* all of *HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT RULES,* specifically *Rule 1(a)(1), Rule 16.1 and/or Rule 16.2,* including its *CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY* and its ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, specifically *EC7-21 and EC7-22,* and/or its *DISCPLINARY RULES;* AND/OR the *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ALL AMENDMENTS, specifically AMENDMENTS ONE, FOUR, SIX, EIGHT, THIRTEEN, FOURTEEN, NINETEEN, TWENTY-SEVEN, AND Five.*

II. *STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED*

For more clarity, can This Court please accept Appellant's Restatement of the Opening Brief's One Question as Two Big Questions, to include also all previous subsidiary questions for consideration by This Court:

1. WHY DOES THE LOWER CIRCUIT COURT'S FAMILY COURT DENY JUSTICE FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE WHO NEVER COMMITTED ADULTERY, DELIBERATE CRIME, OR DELIBERATE SIN AS DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES WHO CONDUCTED A MALICIOUS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

**hereafter referred to as *HSCR*.

DEFENSE FOR INJURY OF APPELLANT, WHO ONCE FEARED APPELLEE'S PHYSICAL VIOLENCE WHICH WAS THE CAUSE OF THE DIVORCE.

2. WHY CAN MALFEASANT ATTORNEYS ENCOURAGE HAWAII'S LOWER COURTS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ATTORNEYS' MALICIOUS MISCONDUCT TO CONDUCT A VACILLATORY DEFENSE AS DELAY FOR HARASSMENT FOR COERCION FOR NON-ASSERTION OF LEGAL RIGHTS FOR INCOME FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE FOR COMPLETE SETTLEMENT AND CUSTODY OF THE CHILDREN TO APPELLANT.

Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se won't demean the position of Appellee's attorney, but he should comprehend the working vocabulary of Law, with all due respect and apologies to any Law Professor.

To continue, *HSCR, Rule 3(b)(3)* has been conformed to, for upon close scrutiny, Appellees' Attorney can find only a single question in the Opening Brief, with subsidiary questions included to explain this single far reaching question querying the cause for 12 (twelve) Supplemental Unconstitutional "financial enslavement" "restraintive" Decisions and four other questionable Decisions such as:

a. How come so little alimony for temporary custody?
b. How come the Order for Supplemental Social Study?
c. How come the Order for a "guardian ad litem"?
d. How come it took 14 (fourteen months before dismissal of the Illegal "guardian ad litem" after all the pleas.

OR,

e. How come the Illegal "restraintive" "trustee" Decision recently?

III. *STATEMENT OF FACT AND POINTS TO BE RELIED ON*

1.A. APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF DOES COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THESE *RULES 3(b)(3), 3(b)(4), 3(b)(5),* AND *3(b)(7)* OF THE *RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT* OF THE STATE OF HAWAII.

This Court can Grant This Appeal for Merits of Pleadings for Complete Settlement of $3 Million for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for Divorce of 20 years of Marriage and/or Restitution for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for Judgment on the Pleadings against Damages caused by Defendant-Appellees for Judicial Misconduct for "financial involuntary enslavement" caused by Defamatory Coercion for Deprivation of income through

Coercion for Non-assertion of Legal Rights for income for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se.

As to *Rule 3(b)(4)*, having explained and discussed conformity to *Rule 3(b)(3)*, it is inconceivable for a case which has been delayed 56 (fifty-six) months from initial introduction to Plaintiff's ex-lawyer, to have a concise statement made of the case, including "record references supporting each statement of fact or mention of trial proceedings" to have less than the number of pages of "background" as set forth in Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se's Opening Brief. For anyone of a reasonable nature can figure 56 months as a total of an approximate 1700 days, whereof even a line a day can encompass about 56 pages of typewritten "Statement of the Case", for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se has not neglected to let a day go by without making any semblance of a Plea for Custody of the Children to Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee for Complete Settlement as Summary Judgment as FREEDOM for same Appellant.

As to *Rule 3(b)(5)*, Appellant's "POINTS TO BE RELIED ON" were all set forth in numbered paragraphs and complied in proper conformity to *Rule 3(b)(5)*.

I.B. I cannot help but lose patience with all of Defendants-Appellees' Attorneys' small unusually cruel tactics of picking on the skin or dressing of the case against this *INSUFFICIENT DEFENSE BY APPELLEES' ATTORNEYS* who don't even see how cruel they have been or how cruel a defense their evil conducted. It is so frustrating to see this in grown men who never really grew up.

For the Opening Brief, though not in exact conformity for form which is outer "skin", should all be considered and not deprived of Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for pro per Legal Pleadings, and the Justices can overlook slight inadvertant non-conformity of form if the subject matter is so pertinent as to overshadow the "skin" of the matter.

I.C. Can This Court please accept point 5. as a conclusive point to be relied on in the Opening Brief, HSC No. 6102:

5. HAWAII'S LOWER FAMILY COURT WAS IN REVERSIBLE ERROR, FOR IT WAS IN VACILLATORY CONFLICT FOR CONCEALED CONSPIRACY FOR PREJUDICED PERSECUTION BY MALICIOUS ABUSE OF JUDICIAL PROCESS FOR COERCED IGNOMINY BY DEFAMATORY DEPRIVATION OF INCOME AND LEGAL RIGHTS FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE AGAINST DELAY AS HARASSMENT FOR COERCION FOR NON-ASSERTION OF LEGAL RIGHTS FOR IN-

COME FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE.

All of this was against Appellees and Appellees' Attorney Malice which conspired against the *HSCR's CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATION, EC7-21*, whereof Appellees' Attorneys were in Violation of this *CODE'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EC2-30*, OR, whereof the lower Court's Misconduct can be challenged, according to this *CODE'S ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EC7-22*.

I.D. Since all of the lower Family Court's Supplemental Decisions are urged as error, as were the Order for the ex-"guardian ad litem", can Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se hereby urge This Court to accept mention of the total Supplemental Decisions and erroneous Order for the ex-"guardian" as sufficient for quotation "wherein the findings""of law are alleged to be erroneous:"

1. Order for Supplemental Social Study, filed 7/10/73 ("tCR", p. 143-144)
2. Supplemental Decision and Order, filed 7/30/73 ("tCR", p. 145-147)
3. Order Appointing Guardian ad litem, filed 11/1/73 ("tCR", p. 236-237)
4. Second Supplemental Order Re Temporary Support Payments, filed 5/10/74 ("tCR", p. 240-243)
5. Further Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 6/10/74 ("tCR", p. 244-246)
6. Fourth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 9/7/74 ("tCR", p. 251-254)
7. Fifth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 10/24/74 ("tCR", p. 259-261)
8. Sixth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 4/4/75 ("tCR", p. 301-311)
9. Supplementary Statement to Sixth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 4/11/75 ("tCR", p. 318-334)
10. Seventh Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 4/11/75 ("tCR", p. 335-337)
11. Eighth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 4/28/75 ("tCR", p. 445-447)
12. Ninth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 6/26/75 ("tCR", p. 532-534)
13. Tenth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 12/3/75 ("tCR", p. 565-567)
14. Eleventh Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 2/2/76 ("tCR", p. 583-611)

POOR COPY

15. Twelfth Supplemental Decision & Order, filed 4/7/76 AND CAN THIS COURT PLEASE ORDER THIS TO BE SENT UP TO HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT PER THIS COURT'S PREROGATIVE AND INITIATIVE, AND/OR PER "MOTION FOR AMENDMENT," FILED MAY 21, 1976.

IV. *ARGUMENTS*

Appellant's Arguments are in conformity and need no further explanation or excuses or addition than to reiterate and urge This Court to Strike the ex-"guardian ad litem" and recent "trustee" Orders of the lower Family Court, according to *HSCR, Rule 75(d)* for Correction by Hawaii's Supreme Court or according to *HR of CP, Rule 12(f)* against scandalous matter as these "Restraintive" Court appointed "trustees" or ex-"guardian" or according to *HR of CP, Rule 26 for DISCOVERY* and *HRS, Chapter 657-20* for Extension against the lower Family Court's Concealed Malice to aid and abet Defendants-Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al's Malice for Concealed Conspiracy for Unconstitutional Prejudiced Persecution as Restraint by Unconstitutional Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process by Misconduct against proper procedure against an Illegal ex-"guardian" Ordered without a proper hearing or Due Process of Law of any kind; and/or the "restraintive" "trustee", both without probable cause, whereby it then constituted an Unconstitutional Judgment against the *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ITS AMENDMENTS:* specifically:

1. *FIRST AMENDMENT:* "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."
2. *FOURTH AMENDMENT:* "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and *no warrants* shall issue, but upon probably cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.
3. *SIXTH AMENDMENT:* "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused (what about aggrieved?) shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have

been committed, which district shall have to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation (what about non-criminal? against "guardians" or "trustees"?) to be confronted with the witnesses against him; (and who did this dirty thing? this false accusation?) to have compulsory process for obtaining witness in his favor (EXHIBIT I), and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense (what about Plaintiff-Appellant as aggrieved party?)

4. *EIGHTH AMENDMENT:* "Excessive bail shall not be required nor excessive fines imposed, nor *cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.*" (Torture by Hawaii's Courts for 56 months' deprivation of income and legal rights.)
5. *THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT:* "SECTION 1. Neither *slavery* nor *involuntary servitude,* except as a punishment for crime (which crime?) whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their Jurisdiction. SECTION 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by legislation."
6. *FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT:* "SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the Jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." (against enslaving trustee agreements? or protection any night by any natural born sons? against coercion for non-assertion of legal rights for Plaintiff Appellant Pro Se) "SECTION 2, 3, 4, & 5 also."
7. *NINETEENTH AMENDMENT:* "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." "SECTION 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

This is also against discrimination of sex whereof women can vote as equals for FREEDOM for equal compensation for equal

working hours for equal capability for equal type of work and therefore equitable settlements for divorce computed at half of Defendant-Appellee Alfred Alphonse Yee's salary at moment of absolute divorce, whereof Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se once was the silent partner and didn't collect the paycheck. For further explanation for this Court, this meant giving advice of all kinds; reading and screening reading material at home to encompass needed information; entertaining and chauffering clients' spouses to eliminate the load on the office, addressing and sending cards to clients and/or friends for goodwill for Christmas or "specials", doing all types of community work if there was time (once even getting bitten by the dog while collecting) under the name of Mrs. Alfred Yee once to build up Alfred's name; cooking nine course dinners and making sure it was served right; making, freezing, and cooking "pupus" of all types for cocktails before taking clients out to dinner; all the while making sure all of OUR five (5) LEGITIMATE CHILDREN were all well taken care of and never were in need of anything and were respectful of grandparents and father, who got more than enough attention, for none of them mentioned were ever left alone and/or were never left without funds for spending.

So, Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se has warned Hawaii's Supreme Court of Defendants-Appellees' Unconstitutional "financial enslavement" of Appellant, who more than deserves half of income at moment of absolute divorce, whereof it is feasible, since Appellees can borrow and pay Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Complete Settlement as Summary Judgment for Merits for Pleadings for Appellant as pled for $3 Million for 20 years of marriage and five (5) legitimate children and/or for Restitution for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se who pleads for this new Order from Hawaii's Supreme Court to include a new Order for Temporary Relief for a money order for $211,850.00 which is a "loan" debt which Alfred Yee does owe Janice Yee, Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, who needs this money as fast as possible, whereof Defendants-Appellee Alfred Alphonse Yee can borrow this money from any bank and pay Plaintiff-Appellant, who should not have been forced to borrow $20,000 at 10% interest whereof almost all has been spent to pay accumulated bills and repayment was contingent on the judgments of the Courts, which turned out Unconstitutional by the lower Family Court and/or Hawaii Supreme Court, who denied relief for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, against the lower Court's Contributory Unconstitutional Judicial "financial enslavement" of a capable

BLEED THROUGH

American woman as Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se who wants to live free against Unconstitutional Judgments against the *UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND AMENDMENTS*, specifically *Amendments one, four, five, six, eight, thirteen, fourteen, nineteen and twenty-seven*, as pled many times before, filed or unfiled, but whereof Hawaii's Supreme Court has the opportunity to consider the pleadings, filed or unfiled, which gives a bad impression of This Court.

May Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se please remind This Court of Appellant's letter of May 3, 1976, asking for and expecting stipulation whereof reason should predominate and stipulation was hopefully granted for nothing to be scheduled from May 3, 1976 to May 20, 1976. Further confirmation for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for good intent for proper legal procedure can be assumed, for copies of Appellee's "Motion to Dismiss" was not received until Monday May 17, 1976 from the Kapalama post office, and five (5) days after is Saturday, May 22, 1976, whereof Plaintiff-Appellant hopes this Reply Brief, filed May 24, 1976 can more than suffice also as a "Motion to Strike Defendants-Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Appeal or in the Alternative to Strike the Opening Brief." How can Appellees dream of Striking the Opening Brief? After all, Appellant's Opening does Appeal against the lower Family Court's Unequitable Judgments which were Unconstitutional and/or Appeals for truth for a capable woman Janice Ching Yee as Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for equitable Complete Settlement for same Appellant who Appeals for Custody of the Children (for true Record) to same Appellant who can teach all of them better. This never was vanity after all for Proof of Merits for same Appellant Janice Ching Yee as real capable Mother of five (5) legitimate children.

V. *CONCLUSION*

Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se hereby Appeals again for This Court to consider and Grant same Appellant's Opening Brief and also reconsider and Grant Appellant's earlier "Motion to Amend Opening Brief", filed March 23, 1976, including its APPENDIX "A", which was the "Motion for Relief of Judgment," filed March 22, 1976, in the lower Family Court, for the lower Court and/or Hawaii's Supreme Court was in Error for Denial of these "Motions" against Unconstitutional Judgments in Violation of *Amendment Thirteen and Fourteen of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION*, or any of the other Amendments discussed, especially Amendment Eight against Cruel

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

and Unusual Punishment as Judicial "financial enslavement" for coercion for non-assertion of Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for COMPLETE SETTLEMENT AS FREEDOM for same Appellant for $3 million as real income for same Appellant Janice Ching Yee for I think I once earned the right to all of this money for Complete Settlement, and hereby demand it for Merit for 20 (twenty) legal years of marriage and 5 (five) legitimate children for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se for Restitution and Remedy also as part of Summary Judgment for Judgment on the Pleadings, per *HR of CP, Rule 56(a) and/or Rule 12(c) respectfully,* for Complete Settlement for Appellant Pro Se.

ALSO, May it hereby be moved to Strike Defendants-Appellees' "Motion to Dismiss" or "Strike", since Defendants-Appellee's "Motion to Dismiss" is INSUFFICIENT AS AN ANSWERING BRIEF, and will Hawaii's Supreme Court please Rule against Defendants-Appellees Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, who are therefore in DEFAULT and Appellees Alfred Yee et al must pay Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee $3 million as Complete Settlement as FREEDOM, according to *HSCR, Rule 3(f),* "when an Appellee," as Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al, "DEFAULT, he will not be heard."

Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se hereby prays Hawaii's Supreme Court will Grant This Reply Brief as well as Appellant's Opening Brief, for Complete Settlement for same Appellant. Additional Confirmation of Reasons for Complete Settlement for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, hereby are included as APPENDIX "A" to "G", which are previously submitted financial data included as part or parcel OR pled as Pleas for Judgment on the Pleadings for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Janice Yee for $3 million, and for This, I thank the Supreme Court of Hawaii.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se

3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

Dated, May 22, 1976.

(APPENDIX "E III")

FILED THROUGH

TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT
STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE C. YEE,	)	FC-D No. 81258
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
ALFRED A. YEE,	)	
	)	
Defendant,	)	
	)	
	)	

By the leave of this court and on behalf of counsel Robert Hogan, will the court please consider the submitted revised statement prepared on March 12, 1973, for Mr. Latham of Harris, Kerr, Forster, and Co., in rebuttal to Mr. Latham's Amended financial statement, estimated monthly expense and statement of position submitted to circuit court on March 6, 1973, by Ed Chun, counsel for the opposition.

Mr. Hogan was advised to submit a copy to the court, but did not, since Mr. Hogan, counsel for the plaintiff, said Mr. Hogan had submitted a copy of his proposal to Ed Chun to the court on February 1, 1973.

Besides, I didn't see Mr. Latham's report until March 11, 1973, and couldn't make a rebuttal for Mr. Hogan until March 12, 1973.

If it please the court, I thank the court to consider this for me.

Dated, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 20, 1973.

(APPENDIX "A" OF APPENDIX "E III")

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

March 12, 1973

Dear Mr. Hogan,

Go back please to the original Feb. 1, 1973 proposal where:

a) a divorce is granted.

b) the care, custody and control is awarded for the minor children of mine, Eric Kwan Sai Yee, born Sept. 20, 1956, Malcolm Ywan On Yee, born June 14, 1958, and Ian Kwan Pung Yee, born Aug. 23, 1962, to me, JCY.

c) adequate financial support provided for the support of each child and the education of each of them which covers college and graduate work. Alfred pays for complete college education.

d) alimony to be paid in the way of financial support of $48,000.00 per year for me, Janice Ching Yee, or $4,000.00 per month. In addition an amount to cover Federal and State income taxes on this amount of $4,000.00 per month to cover the expenses noted separately as EXHIBIT "A".

e) anything gained through non-marital sources from family such as shares of American Security Bank Stock and Lum Yim Kee, Ltd. to be retained by me, JCY.

f) any accumulated property acquired through marriage and generated after more than 20 years of marriage for me, JCY, should be divided in half as noted:

1) just as my house on Alika Ave., completely for me, JCY. This was in exchange for the family house on Palolo Ave.
2) marketable security of any type.
3) note payable by E.E. Black. The initial capital for E.E. Black's note was taken out of savings Aug. 31, 1961, and July 13, 1961.
4) lot #5514 in Keeau, Puna, Hawaii.
5) 5 (five) cemetery plots at Oahu cemetery.
6) the car bought from my money received through my mom should be completely for me, JCY.
7) half of all interest on Guam properties in notes payable, securities, or cash out. If paid in notes payable, it should be completely paid before 1983.
   a. Harmon Field warehouse and property. The initial capital was taken out of savings check #345 on July

BLEED THROUGH

8, 1970 for $12,933.33 and check #352 on July 20, 1970, for $2000.00.

b. Tuman View Apartments. The initial capital for Tuman View apartments was paid for by check #908 out of savings on June 28, 1972 for $10,625.00.

c. Lot #5166-1-R-1-Joint venture. The initial capital was paid for by check #908b for $1000.00 on June 30, 1972, and check #919 for $4000.00 in July 21, 1972.

d. Nobles Furniture. The initial capital for Nobles was taken out of savings check #889 for $15,000 on July 17, 1972 and check #943 for $8000.00 on July 28, 1972, for a truck. Another check #916 for $100.00 was written on July 17, 1972.

e. Academy Gardens Joint venture. On April 21, 1972, check #843 for $ 25,000.00 was taken out of savings.

8) sale of Koali shacks on May 1, 1972 was thrown into savings by AAY. At least half of this amount of $65,983.39 is for me, JCY.

9) vacation accrued amount of $13,291.28. This was thrown into savings on June 7, 1972, of which half should be for me, JCY.

10) If money was borrowed from the company to purchase any of the apartments—Kahala, Marco Polo, or Punahou, it should not be repaid through any of notes payable. After all notes payable were initially taken from savings. Alfred can keep the apartments if money used is repaid. Another example, check #943 for $1,164.72 for patent costs paid by AAY was paid out of savings. This amount should be repaid by AAY. Alfred Yee can keep anything earned on his patents, although Al didn't give me credit just as his initial inspiration for some of them.

All of this just above was money accumulated and acquired through marriage for me, JCY.

g) maintain existing insurance program for me just as primary and all of the children as secondary beneficiaries.

h) HMSA coverage of all children aside from me, JCY.

i) the balance of all counsel fees should be paid by AAY.

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

More than respectfully submitted,

(signed) /s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

P.S. the present level of living is not customary for me, JCY. I never chased after money and never was denied entrance to functions, organizations, or clubs.

(APPENDIX "A" OF APPENDIX "E III")

BLEED THROUGH

EXHIBIT "A"

Al shouldn't have custody of the minors as he can not maintain a separate household for them due to the number of trips made throughout the course of a year. I can therefore incur these expenses provided Al gives an alimony of $4000.00 per month for me, JCY, as projected:

a)	Mortgage	$ 424.00
b)	Punahou per February, 1973, notice: For Eric $1,460 per year Malcolm 1,460 per year Ian 1,360 per year $4,280 per year, or per month:	356.67
c)	Allowance, clothing, books, music, language lessons, kung fu lessons, trips for Eric, Malcolm, and Ian	350.00
d)	Car lease ($174) and expense for children	274.00
e)	Food and miscellaneous sweets for children $150.00 per person (c. $5 per day) times 4 persons	600.00
	candies, cookies, seemoi, etc.—things mailed for Lailan and Mark per month	20.00
f)	Household help temporary twice a week at $20 a day approx. per month	200.00
g)	Telephone and utilities approx. per month	120.00
h)	Terminix at $252.72 per year 1972. 1973?	25.00
i)	Personal and clothes (golf, gas, entertainment, etc.)	300.00
j)	Contributions	200.00
k)	Mark Yee - clothing, books, and allowance and air fare—2 trips at $503. $1006 per year	283.83
l)	Lailan Yee - clothing, books, and allowance and air fare—3 trips at $215.65. $646.95 per yr.	253.91
m)	Maintenance of insurance on life of Al Yee in face amount of $350,000 net of borrowing	275.50
n)	HMSA and dental for self	50.00
o)	Yardwork at approx. $35.00 per week	150.00
	Total spent a month approximate	$3,882.81

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

Alfred can spend the remaining $2,000.00 for subsistence as Al sees fit.

Al Yee should pay the taxes as earlier mentioned.

More than respectfully submitted,

(signed) /s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

March 12, 1973

(APPENDIX "A" OF APPENDIX "E III")

BLEED THROUGH

PLAINTIFF FOR PLAINTIFF

TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT
FAMILY COURT
STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE Plaintiff, vs. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, Defendant.	FC-D. NO. 81258

This is an alternative petition for settlement summarized to add up to $200,000.00 to be deposited in American Security Bank for the past 20 years of marriage *AND* another $1,500,000.00 for me as Janice Ching Yee to be deposited in American Security Bank for the rest of my 30 years of life computed on $50,000.00 per year for over 30 years. After all Alfred A. Yee does make $100,000.00 per year and I just once more than provided the incentive and groundwork for this capital sum per year.

I also want free title to 3169 Alika Ave. for me as Janice Ching Yee without encumbrances of any kind paid for in full by my ex-husband Alfred A. Yee.

The $200,000.00 can be exchanged for property.

The American Security Bank can be used as the clearing house to receive $4000.00 before the first of the month in my name until the complete sum of $1,500,000.00 and interest can be paid completely for me as Mrs. Janice Ching Yee.

This way, I can have custody of the children and take better care of them.

Dated, Honolulu, Hawaii, Apr. 19, 1974

Signed, /s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee,
Plaintiff

(APPENDIX "B" OF APPENDIX "E III")

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

1) Initial capital for *Nobles Furniture*
investment in Guam
A) taken out of savings ck. # 889 = $15,000
(June 9, 1972)
914 = $16,000
(July 17, 1972)
916 = $ 1000
(July 17, 1972)
total = $32,000
my share or ½ = $16,000.00

B) 6/30/73 - Nobles was sold for $52,831.40
at gain of $11,763.44 or ½ = 5,881.72

2) Note Receivable from *E.E. Black* as of 1972
A) initial capital out of savings
8/31/61 and 7/13/61 $26,387.50
my share or ½ = 12,354.67

3) Initial Capital for *Harmon Field Warehouse*
& property was taken out of savings in 1970
= $24,709.33
my share or ½ = 12,354.67

4) Lot #5514 in *Keeau, Puna*
OR 5 cemetery plots at *Oahu cemetery*

5) *Tumon View Apartments* - initial capital was taken
out of savings ck. #345 on 7/8/70 for $12,933.33
#352 on 7/20/70 for 2,000.00
$14,933.33
my share or ½ = 7,466.66

6) *Lot #3166-1-R-1-joint venture* -
initial capital was taken
out of savings ck. # 908b for $1000.00
(6/30/72)
919 for $4,000
(7/21/72)
total $5000.00
my share or ½ = 2,500.00
subtotal $57,396.80

7) Initial Capital for *Academy Gardens*
Joint Venture on 4/21/72
check #843 from savings = $25,000.00
my share or ½ = $12,500.00

8) Proceeds from the sale of Koali shacks on 5/1/72 was thrown into savings in the amount of $65,983.39

my share or ½ = 32,991.70

9) Vacation accrued amount thrown into savings 6/7/72 = $13,291.28

my share or ½ = 6,645.64

10) 1971 figure of profit-sharing fund or figure of Feb. 1973, whichever of the two is greater $65,036.69

my share or ½ = $32,518.34

11) I just am not getting any benefit out of the patents for Al's products so check #943 for for 1972 patent costs should be repaid. $1,164.72 1,164.72

12) Punahou apartments - sold - ½ of Al's share

13) Marco Polo - at least one of the two apartments #1508 worth $54,000.00 OR #1608 worth $54,500,00 54,000.00

14) Hanalei — at least ½ of Al's share

15) Nobles warehouse lease override expected value, 1974, approximately: 10,000.00

16) 200 shares (½) or First Hawaiian Bank stock—est. value as of 4/15/74 quote per Honolulu Star Bulletin 5,000.00

subtotal $112,217.20

balance brought forward $112,217.20

Collection of Back Alimony

2/1/73—temporary alimony of $1000,00 for 15 months (until 4/1/74 $15,000.00

3/12/73—petitioned alimony of $4,000.00 or half of Alfred A. Yee's income per month

for 15 months (until 4/1/74) $60,000.00

Less $15,000.00 temporary income paid -15,000.00

unpaid alimony until 4/1/74

Subtotal $45,000.00

POOR COPY

9/16/71—1/31/73 — 17 months separation where income Alfred A. Yee's $8,000.00 income per month was and is considered accumulated through marriage. ½ or $4,000.00 for 17 mos. =	$68,000.00	
Less undecreed income for 17 months	17,000.00 =	$51,000.00
4/30/73—9/30/74 — decreed additional alimony of $2,200.00		
½ of income	4,000.00	
unpaid alimony for 5 months at $1,800 =		9,000.00
10/1/74—10/30/74 — ½ of income =	$4,000.00	
paid alimony	1,600.00	
unpaid alimony for month		2,400.00
11/1/74—4/1/75 — ½ of income = $4,000.00		
paid alimony 1,400.00		
unpaid alimony for 5 months at $2,600.00 =		13,000.00
Add approximate share for sale of Punahou Apartments and Hanalei	$32,000.00	
subtract approximate amount for mortgage, utilities and groceries for period 9/1/71—4/1/74	32,000.00	
subtotal		$120,400.00
Add balance brought forward		112,217.20
		$232,617.20
Therefore: 8% interest for use of my money =	$18,609.38	
		18,609.38
Money due for Mrs. Janice Ching Yee		$251,226.58

Appendix "B" of Appendix "E III"

BLEED THROUGH

INCOME AND EXPENSES
FOR
MRS. JANICE CHING YEE

INCOME–Monthly from May 1, to Sept., 1974		$2200.00
EXPENSES:–Monthly		
Taxes-Fed. prorated	$ 300.00	
State prorated	100.00	
Mortgage—Alika Ave.	423.00	
Others	400.00	
Pool supplies	20.00	
Liberty House		
For clothes, etc.	150.00	
Gas and car repairs	100.00	
Insurance		
Life, car, etc.,	50.00	
Prorated		
Medical & Dental	20.00	
HMSA	14.00	
Food	350.00	
Printing, postage, etc.	50.00	
Appliance & TV fixings	25.00	
Utilities	70.00	
Telephone	50.00	
Working woman	240.00	
Yardwork	60.00	
Donations	25.00	
Total expended		
Not paid	$2547.00	$2547.00
		($ 347.00)

Dated—Oct. 25, 1974 for Oct. 25, 1974 plea

Exhibit "C"

Appendix C of Appendix "E III"

POOR COPY
NO PAGE NUMBER

UNPAID BILLS
October 25, 1974

Publication of books	$2900.00
	600.00
	400.00
Taxes (Withholding)	4600.00
Chun Hoon Markets	538.00
Val's appliance for freezer	200.00
Pool supplies	133.00
Yardwork	180.00
Bills outstanding —	$9551.00

APPENDIX "C" of APPENDIX "E III"

BLEED THROUGH

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817
Telephone: 595-3426

PLAINTIFF FOR PLAINTIFF

ProSe

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

JANICE CHING YEE, Plaintiff,	)	FC-D No. 81258
vs.	)	PREVIOUS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT: ADDITIONAL MEMORANDUM; AFFIDAVIT OF PLAINTIFF
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, Defendant.	)	

PREVIOUS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff hereby stands on the Motion for Summary Judgment, dated March 31, 1975 and filed April 1, 1975, set for hearing today, April 4, 1975.

Additional memorandum is hereby submitted as attached.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Plaintiff

Dated, April 4, 1975
Honolulu, Hawaii

APPENDIX "D" of APPENDIX "E III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

NOT INCLUDED:

1. PLEADINGS FOR THIS "PREVIOUS MOTION"

2. "MONEY DUE MRS. JANICE CHING YEE"
   EXHIBIT FOR APRIL 19, 1974 PLEA
   (APPENDIX "B" of APPENDIX "E III")

APPENDIX "D" of APPENDIX "E III"

BLEED THROUGH

NO. 5930

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

OCTOBER TERM 1974

JANICE CHING YEE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE,
and/or
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES,

Defendant-Appellee.

) FC-D No. 81258
)
) APPEAL FROM ANY DECISION
) OR JUDGMENT OF THE LOWER
) COURTS OTHER THAN FOR FINAL
) DIVORCE, PAYMENTS DUE
) PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT, AND/OR
) DISCHARGE OF THE "GUARDIAN
) AD LITEM": FOR DIVORCE
) COMPLAINT OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1972
) (INITIATED SEPTEMBER 16, 1971)
) THROUGH TO THE LAST DECISION
) OR JUDGMENT OF THE LOWER
) COURTS FILED JUNE 26, 1975.
)
) FIRST CIRCUIT COURT
) FAMILY COURT

Honorable Betty Vitousek
Judge

MOTION FOR SPECIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CUSTODY; OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR CUSTODY AND RECONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY ALIMONY PAYMENTS AND CHILD SUPPORT

I hereby certify that two copies of these Motions have been sent to attorney Ed Chun, for Defendant-Appellee Alfred Alphonse Yee, properly addressed and postage prepaid, from the U.S. Post Office at Honolulu, Hawaii, this 22nd day of September, 1975.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

(APPENDIX "E" OF APPENDIX "E III")

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

NO. 5930
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII
OCTOBER TERM 1974

JANICE CHING YEE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE,
and/or
ALFRED A. YEE & ASOCIATES,

Defendant-Appellee.

) FC-D No. 81258
)
) APPEAL FROM ANY DECISION
) OR JUDGMENT OF THE LOWER
) COURTS OTHER THAN FOR FINAL
) DIVORCE, PAYMENTS DUE
) PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT, AND/OR
) DISCHARGE OF THE "GUARDIAN
) AD LITEM": FOR DIVORCE
) COMPLAINT OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1972,
) (INITIATED SEPTEMBER 16, 1971)
) THROUGH TO THE LAST DECISION
) OR JUDGMENT OF THE LOWER
) COURTS FILED JUNE 26, 1975.
)
) FIRST CIRCUIT COURT
) FAMILY COURT

Honorable Betty Vitousek
Judge

MOTION FOR SPECIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CUSTODY; OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR CUSTODY AND RECONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY ALIMONY PAYMENTS AND CHILD SUPPORT

These Motions are in addition to Plaintiff-Appellant's OPENING BRIEF FOR APPEAL TO HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT for Plaintiff-Appellant.

The Jurisdiction of this court to hear and grant this APPEAL from Honolulu, Hawaii, residence of the parties involved, rests on *Chapter 602-5 of Hawaii's Revised Statutes* and *Rule 73 of Hawaii's Rules of Civil Procedure* and also by recommendation of the lower court's Judge Betty Vitousek per *page 6 of the "transcript"* of the Friday April 4, 1975 or *"transcript"* of the hearing of June 24, 1975, where all of Plaintiff-Appellant's Motions for Amended Complaints or Reconsideration by Judge Betty Vitousek were denied by the lower court's Betty Vitousek, ex-judge of the case in the family court previously.

By REASON of Judge Betty Vitousek's incompetence and according to *Rule 63 of Hawaii's Rules of Civil Procedure* and the neglect of her office to file Notice of Entry of Order, can the Supreme Court of Hawaii please accept Plaintiff-Appellant Janice Ching Yee's Notice of (original) Appeal of Monday, May 5, 1975 against Judge

BLEED THROUGH

Betty Vitousek's decisions or for the recommendation for Appeal to the Supreme Court, mentioned on Friday, April 4, 1975 as timely, and include the denials of April 23, 1975 and June 24, 1975 as part and parcel of this APPEAL.

Plaintiff-Appellant Janice Ching Yee hereby asks the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii to grant Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for Special Summary Judgment for $3 million for Janice Ching Yee, Plaintiff-Appellant and custody of the children against the degradation and/or humiliation of detailed explanations of why Alfred Alphonse Yee, Defendant-Appellee does owe Plaintiff-Appellant $3 million for all of the MERITS of Plaintiff-Appellant's pertinent Complaints, Amended Complaints, Motions, Memorandums of Law, Arguments, and Exhibits, against Conspiracy or Collusion, as once argued previously, and eight (8) other Conspirators* or Colluders* for the past forty-eight (48) destructive months (from inception of divorce) of Coercion for Destruction.

As a last resort, "IN THE ALTERNATIVE", can the Court grant Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for "TEMPORARY ALIMONY" payment and Child Support immediately for the Monetary Relief for Plaintiff-Appellant to balance Plaintiff-Appellant's Statement of Income and Expenses as follows:

INCOME AND EXPENSES
(Average per month, 1975)

INCOME:	
Alimony	$1,250.00
Repayment of Loan Per "Sixth Supplemental"	350.00
Part repayment of unpaid alimony	83.00
Gift from Mother K.L. Ching	250.00
Parents' trust—gift	80.00
Average dividends—stock	30.00
Sale of books	5.00
APPROXIMATE AVERAGE INCOME PER MONTH	$2,048.00
EXPENSES:	
Federal Taxes, approx. (defrayed due to lack of funds)	$ 200.00
State Taxes, approx. (part defrayed due to lack of funds	200.00

POOR COPY
NO PAGE NUMBER

Mortgage: Alika	419.00
Other	324.00
Pool Supplies	50.00
Unexpected expenses for repair, etc. caused by lack of funds for better equipment)	
Liberty House	150.00
(defrayed for lack of funds for new clothes, or supplies as towels, sheets, stationery, etc.)	
Gas & Car Repairs, tires etc.	100.00
Insurance—life, car, itc.	70.00
Medical & Dental	20.00
(defrayed for lack of funds)	
HMSA	14.00
Food	450.00
Printing, postage, etc.	100.00
Appliance and TV fixing	50.00
(defrayed from lack of funds)	
Utilities—electric, water, gas	125.00
Telephone	50.00
Working woman—for 2 days working 1 day ($120.00 defrayed for lack of funds)	240.00
Yardwork	120.00
Donations—(normal about $100—defrayed)	20.00
APPROXIMATE AVERAGE EXPENSES PER MONTH	$2,698.00

THEREFORE: MONTHLY DEFICIT COMPOUNDED BY DECREASE IN ALIMONY = $ 650.00

MONTHLY DEFICIT COMPOUNDED FORWARDED $ 650.00

DEFICIT OF UNPAID BILLS CAUSED BY LACK OF FUNDS:

Taxes (for withholding)	4,600.00
Chun Hoon Markets	1,331.10
FHB Master Charge	604.75
Phillips Petroleum	92.95
(monthly payments charged—paid 8 out of 17 installments)	

forwarded next page

(APPENDIX "E" OF APPENDIX "E III")

BLEED THROUGH

THEREFORE: MONTHLY DEFICIT COMPOUNDED BY
DECREASE IN ALIMONY AS OPPOSED
TO PLEA OF OCTOBER 25, 1974.1 (EXH. "C" of plea enclosed)
AND ACCUMULATED DEFICIT
OF UNPAID BILLS $7,278.80

Because of this, can the Court RECONSIDER and Grant Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for Special Summary Judgment and Custody; or in the Alternative Grant Motion for Temporary Alimony of $4000.00 per month for Plaintiff-Appellant, so I can also cover the taxes due and slowly but surely pay the grocery bill and FHB bill and other unpaid bills.

Can you believe this doesn't even cover "Child Support" for the four (4) days the children live with Mother JCY, not including the groceries, which should amount to another $500.00 per month, making $100.00 each child for clothes, phone calls, recreation, entertainment (gang doings, or movies, or plays, etc.) film and development or supplies as paper, vitamins, band aid, toothpaste, listerine, from the drugstore. This is an abomination of spirit against this type of details, which should not be drawn out for reasonable men or women.

Why should Judge Betty Vitousek's MALICE cause her to wait from October 25, 1974 until April 4, 1975 to answer a woman's plea for help (not mentioning the other interims of waiting for help) and *then* decrease the alimony instead of increase it? Alfred Yee's gross income for 1974 proved $105,000.00+ and I cannot see any excuse to cut down instead of increase the sum of alimony. Notice Alfred Yee's or Chun's or Judge Betty Vitousek's sneaky way of using the repayment of loan from joint savings ($350.00) added to the minimum alimony of $1250.00 (this covers mortgage and groceries—then everything else is an unpaid bill) to make alimony seem as if it's $1600.00 per month but it isn't really because the extra $350.00 is actually used to catch up on bills in arrears. This way you never catch up. This is COERCED DEGRADATION AND DESTITUTION AND DESTRUCTION BY VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AGAINST DEPRIVATION OF INCOME AND CIVIL RIGHTS.

For a fact, Plaintiff-Appellant has spent $20,000.00 of Plaintiff-Appellant's own money from family savings accounts from birth or inheritance. This was used to pay the bills not reimbursed as of yet. 1972, 1973, and 1974, Alfred Yee's PERJURY OR Ed Chun's

POOR COPY

PERJURY said Alfred Yee was not receiving salary or taking a cut in salary, but how come Alfred Yee reported average gross income of $100,000.00 for 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974? This is not fair and proves for Plaintiff-Appellant against Judge Betty Vitousek who is not capable as judge for Hawaii's Family Court. Can the Supreme Court please Grant Plaintiff-Appellant Janice Ching Yee $3 million for Summary Judgment for REASON and MERIT for monetary claims and for custody of the children by September, 1975 for Punitive, General, Actual, Compensatory, Exemplary and Special Damages, according to Hawaii's Revised Statutes, Sec. 634-46 or Hawaii's Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56(a) OR in the Alternative, Grant Motion for Reconsideration for Temporary Alimony for immediate Relief, should the case extend beyond the month of September, 1975. I hope it does not need to extend after all for with Summary Judgment and all of the REASONS given for MERIT, can the Supreme Court Grant Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for Custody of the children, for as Mother Janice Yee I can take better care of them.

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff-Appellant
Pro Se

Dated September 22, 1975
Honolulu, Hawaii

BLEED THROUGH

EXHIBIT "AFT"*

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES OWE	DAMAGES
Alfred Alphonse Yee &/or	
Alfred A. Yee & Ass. owes for ACTUAL DAMAGES AND EXEMPLARY DAMAGES:+	+500,000.
from loss of insurance (EXH "AFT"-2***	$ 400,000.
from loss of income (EXH. "AXE")	122,529.
Alfred Yee personally owes for PUNITIVE AND/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES**	500,000.
Alfred Yee personally owes for SPECIAL &/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES: ..... against Malfeasance, Malice Conflict, Malicious Malevolent Negligence, Conspiracy, Coerced Ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction, Breach of Contract, Treachery, Swindle, Contributory Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process, Contributory "false arrest", or Restraint of Person, Violation of all Legal Rights for Plaintiff for equal protection by law, Libel, Slander, and Defamation Prejudiced Persecution, Obstruction, Obstruction of Justice, Duress, and/or Restraint of Trade, Perjury.	500,000
Alfred Alphonse Yee &/or Alfred A. Yee & Associates Owes OTHER ACTUAL DAMAGES AND/OR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES ..... AND/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES for declining eyesight, dry hair for lack of hair treatment, &/or for the mental, physical frustration, humiliation, &/or	477,471.

**page 2-Exh. "AFT"
***page 2-Exh. "AFT"

EXHIBIT "AFT"
*from Jan. 26, 1976 "Motion to Grant an Injunction During Pendancy of an Appeal" (filed) for HSC case #6102

APPENDIX "F" of APPENDIX "E III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

mental, physical, and social degradation from frustration from degradation of financial, social, educational, &/or recreational experiences once accustomed to &/or deprived of and the deprivation of Legal Rights and income for Plaintiff for all of the experiences mentioned against Alfred Yee et al for Malice for Conspiracy for Harassment for Prejudiced Judicial Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Coerced ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction.

Alfred Alphonse Yee personally owes for
OTHER EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ..... 500,000.
500,000.
for Extreme Malice for Harassment for personal physical or mental injury of Plaintiff against this Prejudiced Persecution for Deprivation of income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff against this Violation of all Legal rights for Plaintiff for equal income for equal hours of work for equal level of work for equal mental ability against Alfred Yee as instigator of the Conspiracy for Malicious Harassment by Delay as Obstruction of Justice.

THEREFORE DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASS. OWE
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT JCY $3,000,000

**PUNITIVE AND/OR
EXEMPLARY DAMAGES .....$ 500,000.
against Alfred Yee's Malice for Conspiracy for Perjury for Prejudiced Judicial Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Coerced Ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction of Plaintiff for Hawaii's Revised Statutes, Chapter 657-12 for a four (4) years limit for "ALL OTHER PERSONAL ACTION NOT COVERED BY HAWAII'S STATUTES" OR according to Chapter 657-20 of Hawaii's Revised Statutes for a six (6) years limit against "CONCEALMENT" of Malice by Alfred Yee et all for "involuntary servitude" as

BLEED THROUGH

Conflict which gambled on non-assertion of any Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant and all I hold dear, my five legitimate children and custody of these five (5) children to real Mother Janice Ching Yee for Complete Settlement as Summary Judgment so Plaintiff-Appellant can prepare them for the future in the manner we have been accustomed to living.

*** SR 160955 Continental	$100,000.00
4995459 Hancock	10,000.00
5577822 Hancock	10,000.00
6256742 Hancock	20,000.00
6577636 Hancock	50,000.00
7552499 Hancock	200,000.00
6588684 Hancock	10,000.00
	$400,000.00

ALTERNATIVE

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES
OWE PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE .....$3,000,000.
against DEFAULT BY ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE et al, DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES, dated March 31, 1975.
(EXHIBIT "CIV")

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES
OWE PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE .....$3,000,000.

for:

20 years of marriage ×	
$50,000.	per year for equitable settlement for Plaintiff and children
$1,000,000.	for the 20 years (1953-1973) 40+ years more of living for Plaintiff × $50,000. per year for equitable settlement
2,000,000	for the next 40+ years potential future income for which the base was once set by
	the hard work of both parties.
$3,000,000.	

APPENDIX "AXE"*

My ex-husband Alfred A. Yee made, at moment of Final Absolute Divorce, a figure of $100,000.00 ($105,000.00) per year income, including bonuses and dividends and directors fees, which is the basis for these computations, wherefor Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se Janice Ching Yee, as ex-wife of twenty (20) years of marriage whereby 5 legitimate children were born, APPEALS TO HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT TO GRANT AND ORDER COMPLETE FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE, for half of this $100,000.00 or $50,000.00, which can be multiplied by the years of living for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, who wants to live for another 50 years, which makes a total of $2,500,000.00 whereby the other $500,000 can be termed as additional money earned during the last twenty (20) years of marriage, whereby Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, JCY, once worked hard to help build up my ex-husband AAY, and/or the company Alfred A. Yee & Associates, not expecting to be deprived of income, just always with ideas of reaping in our old age, a life of luxury for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, without worries of financial stress or strain, and certainly not baring the cupboard to the Courts or public of Hawaii. This was my idea of the American ideal.

Hereby APPENDIX "AXE" is presented using computations of $400.00 per month for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se (AND PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PRO SE'S FIVE (5) CHILDREN) for the computations of "unpaid alimony or income of half of $8000.00 per month, which would be normal for Alfred Alphonse Yee, as Defendant-Appellee, if situations were not coerced by Judge Betty Vitousek who coerced a financial war between parties by her Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for the Conspiracy, unwittingly aided and abetted by Defendants-Appellees Alfred A. Yee, et al, who co-instigated and also perpetrated Prejudiced Persecution for "judicial financial enslavement" by "coerced incompetency" or "spendthrift" as Defamation for Deprivation of Income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, who never committed adultery, crime, or deliberate sin and therefore didn't warrant this cruel and unusual punishment by Hawaii's lower Courts.

Therefore, will Hawaii's Supreme Court excuse this extra explanation for REASON for Plaintiff-Appellant's seemingly stubborn basis for computations whereby the amounts paid is for alimony,

*Exhibit of Opening Brief, HSC case No. 6102

POOR COPY

mortgage, groceries, and/or all other expenses, not including insurance payments, which is being appealed.

date	*paid*	*half of income*	*unpaid or lost*
Sept. 1971 to Dec. 1971.....	$ 7,200.	$112,000.	$ 4,800.
1972	21,600.	50,000.	28,400.
1973	21,600.	50,000.	28,400.
1974	22,600.	50,000.	27,400.
($17,900)			
1975(actual alimony)	20,000.	50,000.	30,000.
	$93,000.	$212,000.	$119,000.

Based on the article in the early part of November, 1975, the Honolulu Star Bulletin reported the loan expense down to 7.5%, so an added amount of $8,925.00 for interest expense for the use of my money, should be added to the $119,000.00 to make a total of $127,925.00 for actual damages of unpaid or lost alimony. This actual damage is in addition to the damages shown in APPENDIX "AFT" for Complete Settlement as Summary Judgment for Plaintiff-Appellant Pro Se, JCY.

BLEED THROUGH

APPENDIX "AFT"*

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES OWE	DAMAGES
Alfred Alphonse Yee &/or Alfred A. Yee & Ass. owes for ACTUAL DAMAGES AND EXEMPLARY DAMAGES:+	+500,000.
from loss of insurance (APP. "AFT"-2)***	$ 400,000.
from loss of income (APP. "AXE")	122,529.
Alfred Yee personally owes for PUNITIVE AND/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES**	500,000.
Alfred Yee personally owes for SPECIAL &/OR GENERAL &/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES: ..... against Malfeasance, Malice Conflict, Malicious Malevolent Negligence, Conspiracy, Coerced Ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction, Breach of Contract, Treachery, Swindle, Contributory Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process, Contributory "false arrest", or Restraint of Person, Violation of all Legal Rights for Plaintiff for equal protection by law, Libel, Slander, and Defamation Prejudiced Persecution, Obstruction, Obstruction of Justice, Duress, and/or Restraint of Trade, Perjury.	500,000
Alfred Alphonse Yee &/or Alfred A. Yee & Associates Owes OTHER ACTUAL DAMAGES AND/OR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES ..... AND/OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES for declining eyesight, dry hair for lack of hair treatment, &/or for the mental, physical frustration, humiliation, &/or mental, physical, and social degradation from frust-	472,075.

**page 2-APP. "AFT"
***page 2-APP. "AFT"

APPENDIX "AFT" of APPENDIX "G"

APPENDIX "G" of APPENDIX "E III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

ration from degradation of financial, social, educational, &/or recreational experiences once accustomed to &/or deprived of and the deprivation of Legal Rights and income for Plaintiff for all of the experiences mentioned against Alfred Yee et al for Malice for Conspiracy for Harassment for Prejudiced Judicial Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Coerced ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction.

OTHER EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ..... 500,000.
500,000.
for Extreme Malice for Harassment for personal physical or mental injury of Plaintiff against this Prejudiced Persecution for Deprivation of income and Legal Rights for Plaintiff against this Violation of all Legal rights for Plaintiff for equal income for equal hours of work for equal level of work for equal mental ability against Alfred Yee as instigator of the Conspiracy for Malicious Harassment by Delay as Obstruction of Justice.

THEREFORE DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES
ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASS. OWE
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT JCY $3,000,000

**PUNITIVE AND/OR
EXEMPLARY DAMAGES .....$ 500,000.
against Alfred Yee's Malice for Conspiracy for Perjury for Prejudiced Judicial Persecution by Malicious Abuse of Judicial Process for Coerced Ignominy and Coerced Destitution for Coerced Destruction of Plaintiff for Hawaii's Revised Statutes, Chapter 657-12 for a four (4) years limit for "ALL OTHER PERSONAL ACTION NOT COVERED BY HAWAII'S STATUTES" OR according to Chapter 657-20 of Hawaii's Revised Statutes for a six (6) years limit against "CONCEALMENT" of Malice by Alfred Yee et all for "involuntary servitude" as Conflict which gambled on non-assertion of any Legal Rights for Plaintiff-Appellant and all I hold

BLEED THROUGH

dear, my five legitimate children and custody of these five (5) children to real Mother Janice Ching Yee for Complete Settlement as Summary Judgment so Plaintiff-Appellant can prepare them for the future in the manner we have been accustomed to living.

*** SR 16-955 Continental	$100,000.00
4995459 Hancock	10,000.00
5577822 Hancock	10,000.00
6256742 Hancock	20,000.00
6577636 Hancock	50,000.00
7552499 Hancock	200,000.00
6588684 Hancock	10,000.00
	$400,000.00

ALTERNATIVE

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES
OWE PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE .....$3,000,000.
against DEFAULT BY ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE et al, DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES, dated March 31, 1975.
(EXHIBIT "CIV" of case S.C. No. 5930; of the Opening Brief)

APPENDIX "G" of APPENDIX "E III"

POOR COPY

NO PAGE NUMBER

ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE &/OR
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES
OWE PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
PRO SE JANICE CHING YEE .....$3,000,000.

for: 20 years of marriage ×	
× $50,000.	per year for Equitable Settlement
	for Plaintiff-Appellant & Children
$1,000,000.	for the 20 years of 1953-1973
	plus 40 more years of living for Appellant
	× $50,000 per year for Equitable Settlement
2,000,000.	for next 40 years of income once worked for.
$3,000,000.	Complete Settlement

APPENDIX "G" of APPENDIX "E III"

AMENDED

NO. 6102

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII,

OCTOBER TERM 1975

TO: MESSRS. EDWARD Y. C. CHUN and MELVIN Y. KANESHIGE (Chun, Kerr and Dodd), Suite 1408, Amfac Building, 700 Bishop Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 – Attorneys for Defendant–Appellee.

MRS. JANICE CHING YEE, 3169 Alika Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817 – Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT CASE NO. 6102.
entitled: JANICE C. YEE, Plaintiff–Appellant, vs. ALFRED A. YEE, Defendant–Appellee, **the MOTION TO DISMISS THE APPEAL OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE TO STRIKE THE OPENING BRIEF**, filed May 3, 1976.
has been set for argument in the Supreme Court in the Judiciary Building, Honolulu, Hawaii,
on FRIDAY
JUNE 4, 1976 – 9:00 A. M.
(Each side allowed fifteen minutes for argument.)
PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS NOTICE, IN WRITING.

/s/ Edward Suzuki
Edward Suzuki
CLERK

DATE: May 25, 1976

APPENDIX "F III"

POOR COPY

May 28, 1976

HAWAII'S SUPREME COURT
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Sirs:

RE: HSC #6102, Yee vs. Yee

Receipt of Notice for a hearing for HSC #6102 is hereby acknowledged for a written notice for June 4, 1976, 9:00 a.m. and/or phone call by clerk Suzuki for June 4, 1976, 9:30 a.m. as definite last notice.

It is hereby requested for 30 (thirty) minutes for argument for each side or at least Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se if possible.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Mrs. Janice Ching Yee
Plaintiff–Appellant Pro Se
3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

cc: Chun, Kerr & Dodd
for Defendants–Appellees
Alfred Alphonse Yee, et al.